



Class

225.56

Book N16

General Theological Seminary Library

Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.

*Besides the main topic this book also treats of*

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On page

Libr

Sec. for Prom. Rel. and Learn.

W B Roney

1816  
Landon



*Bible - Version*  
**REMARKS**

ON THE  
**VERSION**  
OF THE

**NEW TESTAMENT,**

LATELY EDITED BY THE UNITARIANS,

WITH THE TITLE OF

“AN IMPROVED VERSION UPON THE BASIS OF  
ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S NEW TRANSLATION,  
WITH A CORRECTED TEXT, AND NOTES CRITICAL  
AND EXPLANATORY. LONDON, 1808;”

BEING

*A DISPASSIONATE APPEAL*  
TO CHRISTIANS OF VARIOUS DENOMINATIONS  
ON SOME OF THE FIRST  
AND  
MOST GENERALLY RECEIVED  
DOCTRINES OF THE BIBLE.

BY THE REV. EDWARD NARES, M.A.

RECTOR OF BIDDENDEN, KENT;

AUTHOR OF THE HAMPTON LECTURE SERMONS FOR 1805, &c.

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY  
LIBRARY  
NEW YORK

“Surely one of the first duties of a Christian, is to impart to others the knowledge with which he has himself been favoured. Christianity will not allow that when a man has lighted a candle, he should put it under a bushel; and as we would escape the doom of the wicked and sloathful servant; we must not bury our talent, however mean, in the earth. Impressed with these momentous considerations the serious Christian will feel it to be an imperious duty to contribute his utmost efforts to instruct and benefit his fellow creatures; and to enter his grave and solemn protest against those errors which disfigure and disgrace the Christian religion.” *Belsham's Letters on Arianism*, 1808, p. 18.

**London:**

PRINTED FOR T. CADELL AND W. DAVIES, STRAND.  
1810.

22/5/6  
 N 16  
 1810  
 2385  
 N 16  
 1810

INTRODUCTION


0478

I AM very ready to confess that I stand this  
 Book into the world with extreme reluctance and  
 concern. Controversy is not from being the  
 light of my heart: but I know not how I could  
 with credit retire from the publication of the  
 present work. Friends have been led to expect it  
 of me in consequence of a hasty notice which I  
 gave long ago of my intention to come for-  
 ward, and adversaries have attacked me before  
 they heard what I have to say. THE SEMINARY  
 upon the improved Version, formed a LIBRARY  
 may seem to be or not be intended. I have  
 against whom they might be supposed to be  
 directed, yet to them already as a Work that may  
 or may not be extant. They care not about them.  
 I verily believe they do not; and perhaps I am no  
 antagonist whom they need to fear, however good  
 the cause may be that I may presume to advocate;  
 but I mean to be honest and sincere, and of all the  
 that can be to my fellow Christians; therefore what

Printed by Law and Gilbert, St. John's Square, London.



## INTRODUCTION.



I AM very ready to confess, that I send this Book into the world with extreme reluctance and concern. Controversy is far from being the delight of my heart: but I know not how I could with credit refrain from the publication of the present work. Friends have been led to expect it of me in consequence of a hasty notice which I gave long ago of my intentions to come forward, and adversaries have attacked me, before they heard what I have to say. My Remarks upon the improved Version, formerly announced, may, it seems, be or not be, published. Those against whom they might be supposed to be directed; refer to them already, as a Work that may or may not be extant. They care not about them. I verily believe they do not; and perhaps I am no antagonist whom they need to fear, however good the cause may be, that I may presume to advocate; but I mean to be honest and sincere, and of all the use I can be, to my fellow Christians; therefore, what-

ever I at any time happen to know, the disclosure of which may appear to me to be of any public importance, assuredly the world shall know also, as far as my means extend.

In the month of May, 1809, the improved Version first came into my possession. I had perused but little of it, before I found much to object to, and yet nothing but what appeared to me easy to answer. In some haste, I authorised the Editors of the *British Critic* to announce to the public, that I was preparing Remarks on the New Version, for the Press. This notice was accordingly given, among their other articles of Literary Intelligence in the Review for June, 1809. I did not then foresee, what has happened since, that it would so soon engage the attention of other Critics more able and eminent than myself, or that they would go so largely into the subject. It was not till after I had announced the publication of my own Remarks, that I had an opportunity of seeing what appeared upon the subject in the *Quarterly* and *Eclectic Reviews*, and other periodical works. I felt that the necessity for my own interference was in a great degree superseded, and that much of what I was prepared to say had already been better said by others. This naturally excited in my mind many doubts as to the expediency of a separate publication, and I did not hesitate to transmit all that I had then written to the Editors of the *British Critic*, partly intending to adopt no other



other method of communicating my sentiments to the public. What I then sent exceeded the ordinary limits of their Review, and they therefore concluded the second article with a statement to this effect, adding my initials, which became as it were a second pledge by which I stood committed to adventure farther: from the circumstances mentioned above however, my anxiety upon the subject was greatly abated, and a long time elapsed before I judged it necessary to get back the papers transmitted to the Editors of the *British Critic*.

It has fallen in my way of late to know more, than I knew some time ago, of the extraordinary zeal and industry with which the *Unitarians* are endeavouring to bring the *improved Version* into notice; recommending it from their pulpits, and in all periodical works with which they are connected, in the strongest manner, not only as a more correct translation of the written word of God, but as tending to *do away* "many sources of error," and to enable the world to "form just ideas of true and uncorrupted Christianity."

Constantly engaged as I am, in my ministerial capacity, in expounding the great truths of Christ's Gospel, to a large congregation of my fellow Christians, how could I be expected to see without some uneasiness, the publication of a book, in three Editions at once, and the circulation of it in my immediate neighbourhood, in which the leading doctrines of the church were peremptorily contradicted;

tradicted; doctrines which I had most confidently believed to be truth, and truth of the first importance, (and which I had taught and inculcated as such,) denounced for ever, as falshood and absurdity, not in any manner deducible from the real words of Scripture.

How to regulate one's feelings upon such occasions, I find to be a matter of extreme difficulty. To resist such an attack is thought quarrelsome and intolerant: not to resist it, is sure to be considered as a demonstrative proof of weakness and defeat, especially where a person happens to be known to have engaged previously in such disputes. Such considerations have contributed to perplex and disturb my mind; and have certainly had the effect of making me tardy, and sometimes careless about the publication of my work, to a degree that I fear may in many ways be prejudicial, even to the cause I take in hand; so far as truth can be injured by the defects of an individual. Some may probably think that what has apparently taken so much time to answer, was not really to be answered in a shorter time. Some may think that all the interval that has elapsed between the first notice given, and the actual publication of my book, has been occupied in preparing materials for it, and therefore that the answer might have been more complete; but this would be totally contrary to the real state of the case. Some may suppose that I have done much more than I really have



have done, to qualify myself for the task I have taken ; that I have consulted public libraries, and communicated with other persons upon the subject ; but I can solemnly declare, that what is now presented to the public has been prepared under circumstances of peculiar disadvantage ; without assistance from any public library, and (with two exceptions only), without the smallest intercourse upon the subject with any other persons whatsoever. And I wish it to be understood, that my only motive for mentioning these things is, that I should be extremely sorry to have it supposed that what I have found to say upon the subject, does in reality amount to so much as one-fourth part of the just defence which the Church has it in her power to make. I have attempted nothing more than to examine into certain points of controversy, with the limited assistance of a very small collection of books, and in a state of rural retirement bordering upon absolute seclusion. Still I must confess, I have found more to say upon the subject than I expected, and, in some respects, I am sorry that it amounts to so much. I am sorry also, that I have not always been able to keep within the bounds of perfect civility.

I earnestly desire, in questions of this nature, especially where an appeal is to be made to the public, to abstain from all asperity of language, and rudeness of speech whatsoever, and yet I find it impossible altogether to avoid it. The truth can  
scarcely

scarcely be spoken otherwise. How can the resort to a positive charge of falsification be rendered courteous? How can one defend oneself with effect against the cry, or even the *insinuation* of *hypocrisy, ignorance, bigotry, deceit, want of candor, liberality, &c.* without some glow of honest resentment? In my own estimation, it is an act of rudeness to accuse any man or body of men of a deliberate *trick* or *design to impose*, and yet there is a course of conduct adopted by many, which cannot be exposed and made known, with proper advantage to the world in general, but by such a representation of matters as must seem to amount to such a charge. It is a wise provision of the Law, to oblige every witness to tell not only *the truth*, but the *whole truth*, and not only the whole truth, but *nothing but the truth*. There are many shades of difference between these several degrees of testimony. It cannot be thought in general to be any trick to lay *the truth* before the public; but yet the world may be misled even by such a measure, if by any partial suppression of matters of fact, the *whole truth* shall be withheld from it. I will give an instance of what I mean.

It has of late been proposed by a learned, and generally a very ingenuous writer, of the Unitarian party, for the express purpose of propagating their *Anti-Trinitarian* notions, to publish *selections* from the works of eminent *Trinitarians*, such as *Law's "Serious Call,"* and Bishop *Jeremy Taylor's "Rule*  
*of*



of *Holy Living and Dying*, "unmixed with those sentiments which the Unitarians deem unfounded in the Gospel." Now without attempting to dispute the right which the Unitarians may freely enjoy of propagating their own tenets in distinct works, surely it would be dealing very unfairly by Trinitarian writers, and indeed misleading the public greatly to publish such works, as *theirs*, subject to a studied curtailment of the most essential doctrines of their creed.

The writer I allude to, declares that he thinks Trinitarian *Prayers*, and Trinitarian *Hymns*, have done at least as much to make Trinitarianism appear Christianity, as any reasoning, and certainly as any appeal to the Scriptures. Be it so; yet if the composers of those prayers and hymns thought and felt that *their* doctrines were strictly conformable to the Scriptures, surely Unitarians have no right to turn their works against themselves. I call upon the devout admirers of Dr. *Watts's* pathetic hymns, for instance, to contemplate the injury that might be done to that pious and good man, by such a *partial selection* from his works, published as *his own* devotional compositions: so strong were *his* feelings on the subject of the Trinity, so forward and so earnest was he to bear testimony to the truth of it, as a fundamental of his faith, that one whole division of his hymns in some Editions, (if I am not much mistaken,) is appropriated to the *doxology* alone, wherein under  
a great

a great variety of forms, he gives glory to the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST.

In the *Monthly Repository* for December, 1809, Mr. Aspland has given us a direct scheme for the publication of 350 hymns in this way of *selection*. In which indeed we are told, that “none that are borrowed are to be garbled or otherwise altered than by the omission of verses where the *length is inconvenient*. The hymns to be chiefly expressive of *gratitude* and *praise*. Every hymn to be of such *moderate* length, as to *preclude the necessity* in using it, of passing over *particular* verses. The Unitarian scheme of the *nature and character* of the *Supreme Being*, to be *carefully kept in view* throughout the selection; but as it will be designed for Unitarian *Christians*, a large proportion of the hymns will be on the subject of the *excellence and dignity* of Christ’s *character*, the *Supreme* importance of his divine *Mission*, and the *blessings* of the *Gospel*.” Now I cannot rate the abilities of the Unitarian party so low, as to suppose, that they could not find persons among themselves capable of composing 350 hymns of such *moderate and convenient length*, without meddling at all with the works of their adversaries; but *probably* the very name of *Watts* and other *Trinitarian* composers, may serve to allure some unwary friends to that doctrine, into Unitarian places of worship. To accuse them openly of any deliberate trick upon such an occasion must sound rude, and yet it surely behoves any real friend to the Trinitarian doctrines



doctrines to point it out as a piece of management, likely, by the confession of Unitarians themselves, to be speedily employed against us.

I have ventured to say in my book that it *looks like* a trick to have put the names of two Archbishops into the title page of this Version. I protest, I mean to say this also in the way of caution, because if the *Version* were quite conformable to Archbishop Newcome's, (which is by no means the case, nor are the deviations from it by any means so carefully noticed as the Introduction would lead us to suppose,) some of the notes annexed are directly in opposition to him. An Edition of a *New Text and Version* of the New Testament, was many years ago dedicated to a noble Lord, distinguished by his learning in theological matters; from which circumstance that great person was in danger of being wrongfully supposed to be an encourager of the work; had he not taken timely care to make it known among his friends, that he neither knew the Editor, nor approved his performance. And it was certainly fortunate that he was still alive to vindicate his own fame.

There is something going forward also among the Unitarians which I can scarcely bring myself to mention, because they certainly have a perfect right in this instance to act exactly as they please, and as they do, and yet I think the public should be made aware of it. I see in the *obituary* of the *Monthly Repository*, more notice taken of the death  
of

of any *Female*, who happens, in ever so remote a part of the kingdom, to have espoused the Unitarian doctrines, than would probably be taken of the decease of the *French Emperor*. I would not deprive that amiable sex of the privilege of thinking for themselves, but I conceive them to be, from the common course of their education, by no means competent judges of the question as a matter of Biblical Criticism, which the Unitarians make it, and therefore very liable to be misled, and consequently to *mislead others*; and it happens that, *Mistresses of Schools and Seminaries*, are particularly among the number. To confer *unexampled public* honours and distinctions upon them therefore, merely for their deviations from and opposition to the Trinitarian doctrines, is surely a trap laid for the sex in general; and not a very complimentary one. I grieve to descend to such particulars, but since it is now the avowed purpose of the Society to propagate their doctrines by all possible means, as *established funds, distribution of books, itinerant ministers, reviews, New Versions, &c.* \*; I cannot

\* The following is the authorised account of the articles of the Unitarian Fund, instituted March 4, 1806, Chapel, Parliament Court, Artillery Lane; Article I. This Society shall be denominated The Unitarian Fund for promoting Unitarianism by means of popular preaching. Article II. The uses to which the fund raised by this Society shall be applied, shall be 1st, To enable poor Unitarian congregations to carry on religious



cannot avoid putting the question upon as fair a footing as I can, by this timely notice to Trinitarians of all descriptions.

Any asperity of language that might be avoided is very unbecoming, and I hope I may safely say, it is very contrary to my natural disposition, to have recourse to it. No conscientious dissenter, I trust, will ever have to accuse me of any failure in personal respect, but we all know ourselves imperfectly, and should therefore be ready to make allowances one for the other.

An Unitarian writer in the Monthly Repository, speaking of Bishop Warburton's Letters, says, if they have the effect of teaching how Christianity ought *not* to be defended, by showing that contempt and arrogance are insufferable in the mightiest minds, they will have done great good. Now as a general remark, I cordially agree with this writer. Contempt and arrogance should be sedulously avoided: and yet in the very same Volume of the Repository, *thus* does an *Unitarian writer*, begin his defence of the *improved Version*, against the Quarterly Reviewers in particular, but *generally*

religious worship; 2d, To reimburse the travelling and other expences of Teachers who may contribute their labours to the preaching of the Gospel on the Unitarian principles; 3d, To relieve those Christian ministers who by embracing Unitarianism subject themselves to Poverty.

*also,*

also, (as the expressions imply,) against *all* who hold the Trinitarian and other doctrines.

“It is not at all surprising that the interested or prejudiced advocates for popular creeds, have taken the alarm, and that as usual in such cases, they are *opening in full cry to run the obnoxious victim down*. The Editors could expect \* no other treatment as the work came to be more generally known and the alarm to spread. *Well may the old serpent hiss and writhe and struggle, when truth ever victorious is trampling upon his head*. If ignorance, calumny, and hardihood of assertion can produce the effect, they, (the Quarterly Reviewers,) intend, they will indeed put an extinguisher over this *newly kindled lamp*.”

Now surely this is not only ample apology for any asperity of language on the part of the Quarterly Reviewers, but would justify them even if they had descended (which I think them incapable of doing) to the utmost *violence and vulgarity of style*.

In the improved Version itself, however, and generally in the notes, there is certainly nothing of this kind to complain of; no vulgar or abusive

\* As this paper is signed B, and dated from Hackney, and Mr. Belsham's picture has been engraved by Schiavonetti, at the expence of the Unitarian fund, for his labours in preparing the improved Version, surely he must be the writer.



language at all, and much in the regular way of criticism. There are indeed, in the introduction, (which is a valuable piece in itself,) *insinuations* conveyed by certain terms which I have judged it not amiss to notice in my book, though perhaps we are all liable occasionally to trespass in this particular. I am sorry to make this introduction so long, but I have still something to say on the general effect of the publication in question.

An *improved* version, and a *corrected* text, must necessarily imply a previous capability of improvement and need of correction. It is fit therefore that the real state of the case should be fairly and impartially represented; and here I am happy to be able to give the Editors praise. The Introduction to this Version for the most part is very good, as an historical memoir; it brings into a small compass a large mass of important information; it is in short, chiefly an abridgement of the *Prolegomena* of Griesbach, and consequently must contain most of what we want to know, of the exact state and circumstances of the text of the New Testament: still however I have some few observations to make upon the subject\*. Biblical Criticism is a branch of study little thought of by the generality of people; what is put before them they are able to read, and from that to form their ideas; but how that which is put before them, has been prepared and compiled,

\* The Eclectic Review should be consulted.

they are very little able to judge. The present edition is set forth as an *Improved Version* of the New Testament, formed on a *particularly correct text*, with an intent to *get rid of certain doctrines*, as palpable corruptions of Christianity; *implying* certainly, that an *improved Version* and *corrected text*, were *wanting* for these purposes; and consequently that all other texts and translations were not only faulty and defective, but calculated to *mislead* the public in points of great importance; especially the *received text* and *common version*, which the Editors more immediately profess to have improved upon and amended. They adopt, we are told, Archbishop *Newcome's* version and *Griesbach's* text. This is well, and I do not wish to object to it, because both *Newcome* and *Griesbach* were great critics, and have shown themselves *by no means inclined* to deprive the Unitarians of any tolerably fair advantages.

I must, however, have leave to enquire what is the full amount and exact value of their labours, with a view to the disputes between Trinitarians and Unitarians? I declare that it appears to me to be perfectly trifling, or rather of no serious account at all. This can only be said upon the authority of some examination and scrutiny of matters; I really think then, that the amendments and alterations resulting from the labours of all the modern critics, are exceedingly insignificant, as to the real contents of the sacred writings,  
though



though extremely valuable in many respects, perhaps I may reasonably add, on this very account. I would not be thought inclined to withhold the praise that is justly due to the extraordinary exertions of the German critics, *Wetstein, Semler, Griesbach, &c.*; they have certainly great claims to our admiration, they have studied hard and done much; so much, that I am frequently as much astonished at their labours, as any of those can be, who are most sanguine about the general result of their pains: still I must declare that I think much of their time, has, as it turns out, been spent in vain, but certainly so, with respect to all that relates to the doctrine of the Trinity, &c.

I will explain as well as I can what I wish to say. It is well known that when Dr. *Mill* first published his various lections to the amount, as it was calculated of 30,000, infidels began to triumph, and some over-timid Christians were panic-struck; there *may be* infidels, and there *may be* tender-minded Christians at this moment, to whom the sound of 150,000 *various readings* may be alike acceptable or unacceptable, only in a much greater degree. I would not do the Editors any injustice; they themselves certainly state the case perfectly well in one part of their introduction; they observe, p. xxvii, that “these various readings, though very numerous, do not in any degree affect the general credit and integrity of the text.

The general uniformity of which, in so many copies, scattered through all countries in the known world, and in so great a variety of languages, is truly astonishing, and demonstrates both the veneration in which the Scriptures were held, and the great care which was taken in transcribing them. Of the hundred and fifty thousand various readings, which have been discovered by the sagacity and diligence of Collators, not one-tenth, nor one-hundredth part, make any preceptible, or at least any material alteration in the sense. This will appear credible, if we consider that every, the minutest deviation, from the received text, has been carefully noted, so that the insertion or omission of an article, the substitution of a word for its equivalent, the transposition of a word or two in a sentence, and even variations in orthography have been added to the catalogue of various readings."

Now this representation of matters is exceedingly just, and tends to show what is the exact amount of the assistance derived from the labours of modern collators. They have with infinite pains most certainly amassed an immense quantity of information, to this end only as it appears to me, namely, to prove that we could either have done without the information, or that the acquisition only tends to fix us all exactly where we were before.

The Editors in their introduction lay a stress on three passages only, as of *great importance* to their cause,



cause, viz. Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John v. 7. But Dr. Carpenter, in his sermon at Bristol, June 1808, in which he recommends the Improved Version in the strongest terms, selects twenty passages, which, as he says, have "*connection with the Unitarian tenets,*" and which the Improved Version has properly corrected, to the great benefit, as is implied, of the public in general. Now let every one of these passages be turned against us, if I can prove that Trinitarians have heretofore felt strong enough without them, I think I shall show at once that the improvements and corrections of the present Editors, are really of no account at all, as to the questions between us and them. The *Eclectic Reviewers*, who have given us a critique on the Improved Version, that abounds in learning and information, incline to give up all the three passages, Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John v. 7. I have said what I think of them in my book, to which I must now refer; but I shall here beg leave to observe, that in regard to two of the three, viz. 1 Tim. iii. 16, and 1 John v. 7; the Unitarians themselves seem to me to admit the fact, viz. that Trinitarians can do quite as well without them, for one of their arguments (and no weak one certainly) to prove them spurious, is, that they were never cited in the disputes between the *Athanasians* and *Arians*. Now when we consider the exact nature of these disputes, *whichever side we take*, it is certainly a plain proof, that (against Unitarians,)

neither party thought the canon without these texts as now read, deficient in proper evidences that Christ was a super-angelic pre-existent Being, nay even GOD. I say, *whichever side we take*, because I must confess that *Arians* (and I might add *Socinians*) seem to me by *their* interpretations, to prove the point more strongly against *Unitarians* than the orthodox Trinitarians; for if the Scriptural expressions are really such as to induce *Arians* and *Socinians* to acknowledge Christ to be a *subordinate* or *factitious* God, rather than believe him to be *mere man*, surely the dilemma to which *they* reduce themselves is a striking proof, that they would never run so much *greater* a risk than the proper Trinitarians, of trenching upon the *Unity*, except that his mere humanity appears at all events, irreconcilable to the language of Scripture.

The *Negative* testimony therefore of *Athanasians* and *Arians* in their disputes, against these passages, is to me, as far as it is valid, a plain proof that as to the main question, they are really of no account at all; we may retain them or give them up as we please; all that they have been supposed to contain is to be found elsewhere, in the most newly corrected text of Scripture, and the most modern versions, not excepting the present improved one; besides it appears from the Editors own note, that in regard to 1 John v. 7, *Erasmus*, *Zuinglius*, *Luther*, did without it, and more recently, as Mr. Porson observes, *Simon*, *La Croze*, *Michaelis*, and *Griesbach*,

*Griesbach*, whom Dr. Carpenter particularly calls, a “liberal *Trinitarian*.”

But Dr. Carpenter himself produces *twenty* passages, the three above being included; I have shown that of those three, *Trinitarians* of old have been supposed to defend their cause strongly enough without two of them, and I shall now proceed to examine those which Dr. Carpenter dwells upon.

It is at least implied, both by the Editors and their supporters, if not expressly insisted upon, that the *public* were *never before* provided with so *correct* a text, or so *impartial* a Version, as in the present instance; but what if I produce a *Greek text* and an *English Version*, nearly an hundred years old, that is, all printed and published, before the *Wetsteins* (the younger at least) or *Griesbachs* were heard of or known; agreeing in most points with even the *second Edition* of *Griesbach*, *Newcome*, and even the *Improved Version* itself? I have now lying before me then, an Edition of the New Testament in *Greek* and *English*, published in two volumes in the years 1715 and 1718. I have been careful to collate more than once this very Edition word for word with *Griesbach's* second Edition, and I must protest that the variations in general are so frivolous, that if a correct text was all I wanted, I could freely commit to the flames nearly the whole that I have acquired from *Griesbach*.



In the Edition that I speak of, (which the learned in general will know to be Dr. *Wells's*,) there are many variations and deviations from the received text, but it so happens that scarcely any of importance occur, that are not particularly approved by *Griesbach*. Even the *English Version* and paraphrase have the sanction of Archbishop *Newcome* in many points of great importance, so that for *my own* studies, I have really gained little from the most minute examination of *Griesbach's* numerous references, *Newcome's* translation, or the *Version* before us, except the satisfaction of being assured that I was quite safe long ago, and that the public might have been so 95 or 92 years at least, before the appearance of the present *Improved Version*. I do not however mean to deny, that the passages spoken of above are to be found in this edition as they stand in the received text: I have therefore judged it to be the more necessary to treat of them both in this Introduction, and the book itself, but I can safely assure Dr. *Carpenter*, that exclusive of these three passages, out of seventeen that remain, of those *he* has selected, in no less than sixteen instances, *Wells* perfectly agrees with *Griesbach* and the Editors, both in the correction of the *Greek text*, and the *rendering* of the passages; and in regard to the *only* place where they differ, viz. Rev. ii. 7, though the pronoun  $\mu\varsigma$  may there be accidentally omitted after  $\Theta\epsilon\varsigma$ , it is as carefully inserted  
under

under similar circumstances, chap. iii. 2; so that this scarcely amounts to any real difference\*.

It is certainly both curious and satisfactory to observe how very little of the sacred text *requires* to be *changed*, though no less than an hundred years ago 30,000 various readings were discovered, and now the number is increased to 150,000. Having as I stated, diligently collated the Greek text of the learned Wells with Griesbach's second Edition, I shall here give a specimen of the exact amount of the later discoveries as far as it respects one book of the New Testament, namely, the Gospel of St. John. Great suspicions seem to exist

\* Many other circumstances deserving of notice have struck me in the collation of the several Editions before me. Sometimes Wells ventures to *reject* what Griesbach marks as *probably to be omitted*; sometimes he does this where he is supported *against* Griesbach by *Newcome* and *Wakefield*, and even the *Editors of the Improved Version*. Sometimes he adopts a conjectural reading, which, though approved by *Griesbach*, could not with propriety be taken into *his* text; this is the case Heb. xii. 15. Sometimes, (as in the reading of Jude, 25,) Wells agrees with the *Editors*, and *Griesbach*, against the received text and *Newcome*; sometimes *Wells* agrees with *Griesbach* against the *Editors*, *Newcome* and *Pearce*, as Acts xi. 20. Often he avails himself of readings approved by *Griesbach* to clear up difficulties which have heretofore perplexed all commentators, and generally with good effect—Philipp. i. 5, Wells renders *Κοινωνία* contribution, which the Editors adopt against *Newcome* giving Mr. *Wakefield* the credit of it.

in regard to the particles  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  and  $\delta\epsilon$ , which are continually rejected by Griesbach, or marked as doubtful; so that a “*but*,” and a “*then*” and “*therefore*” are rendered very questionable wherever they occur in the writings of this Apostle. It is doubtful whether John i. 26, should be read, BUT there standeth one among you, or, THERE standeth one among you, without BUT; it is doubtful whether John iv. 9 should be read, “THEN saith the woman of Samaria;” or, “saith the woman of Samaria.” The amount of the suspicions concerning the particle  $\delta\epsilon$ , is as 18 or 19, of the particle  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ , as 32; the copulative  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ , and, is doubtful to the amount of 21; the article  $\delta$  before  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  or  $\text{I}\eta\varsigma\upsilon\varsigma$ , is doubtful to the amount of 33;  $\tau\omega$ , and  $\tau\epsilon$ ,  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , &c. before nouns and proper names are liable to some suspicion;  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\upsilon$  and  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\text{ν}\epsilon\varsigma$  might it seems without hazard be omitted, the subjunctive be changed with effect for the indicative and vice versâ; the authorities for  $\text{Μεσσι}\alpha\varsigma$  and  $\text{Μεσ}\iota\alpha\varsigma$ , and for  $\text{Ναζα}\rho\epsilon\theta$  and  $\text{Ναζα}\rho\epsilon\tau$  seem to be equal.

I do not mean to infer that particles, &c. because they are small words, are therefore unimportant. I am quite aware that, “*non sunt ubique aded exigua ut contemni debeant, inde enim pendet aliquando valde utilis sensus;*” but, I have diligently examined every passage in which the above various readings occur in the Gospel of St. John, and can safely pronounce them to be of no moment.



ment\*. The following is a fair and exact statement of the result of my examination of the two Greek texts of this book in Griesbach and Wells, (occasionally consulting an *Elzevir* edition,) and the English Versions of *Wells*, *Newcome*, and the *Editors*. I shall put down first the total of various readings in each chapter, and secondly, the number of those that affect the text, that is, which have the *siglæ* prefixed in Griesbach's text and margin.

Chap. I. Number of various readings, in all LXXXVII, of those that affect the text XXII; one only of any importance, viz. ver. 28. *βηθαινα* for *βηθαλαρα*, and this is noticed in the margin of my *Elzevir* Edition, 1658.

Chap. II. various readings, in all LIV, affecting the text VII; all unimportant; *Καταφαιλα* for *κατεφαγε*, ver. 17; noticed in my *Elzevir* Edition. The received text, and *Wells* more conformable to the LXX.

Chap. III. various readings, in all LXX, affecting the text XII; two only of any importance; ver. 13, *ὁ ὡν ἐν ἑραυῳ* marked by Griesbach as somewhat doubtful, by the Editors inclosed in brackets, which with them is the mark of probable omission,

\* According to Griesbach himself the number might have been increased, but as he justly observes, "*in ponderandis atque cum pulvisculo excutiendis talibus minutis, sensum orationis nullo modo attingentibus, diligentia editoris, tametsi ferrea, tandem frangitur.*" Proleg. Sect. ii. XLIV.

and therefore tends to confound matters; they note that the clause is wanting in some of the best copies, but Griesbach produces only five authorities for the omission of the whole, viz. two *Uncial*. 33. The *Æthiopic Version* and *Gregory Nazianzen*.

Ver. 25; for *Isdziaov* Griesbach has *Isdziz*, which is noted in the margin of my *Elzevir*, and taken into the text by *Wells*.

Chap. IV. various lections, in all CII, affecting the text XXIII; not one of any importance, most of them noticed in the margin of my *Elzevir*.

Chap. V. *various lections*, in all XCIX, affecting the text X; one only of importance, ver. 4, marked as probably to be omitted by Griesbach, printed in *italics* by the Editors; the doubts in regard to this verse are not new. See *Whitby's Examen. Millii*, and the *Prolegomena* of the latter. See also *Trapp* on the Gospels, and *Doddridge* on the place.

Chap. VI. *various lections*, in all CXL, affecting the text XXXVI; not one of importance, ver. 11, *Wells* discards *τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταί*, which Griesbach marks as probably to be omitted; their absence from ancient MSS. is noticed in my *Elzevir*, 1658.

Chap. VII. *various lections*, in all CII, affecting the text XX, most of them quite unimportant, ver. 8, Griesbach rejects *επω*, and takes *ε* before *αναβαινω*; *Wells* had done exactly the same before him,

him, admirably and very honestly explaining in his note the probable ground of the corruption, as intended to set aside *Porphry's* objections. He does not scruple however to render it "not yet," in which sense Newcome and the Editors seem to agree, who render it "not now."

Griesbach discards *αληθως* from ver. 26; Wells does the same; the latter also notices the punctuation adopted by Griesbach, ver. 21, 22; though he does not follow it himself.

Chap. VIII. *various lections*, in all CLXVI, affecting the text XXIV; all of them unimportant except the first, beginning Chap. VII. ver. 53, from whence to the end of ver. 11. Chap. VIII. Griesbach marks the whole as probably to be omitted, and the Editors print it in italics. Wells does not express any doubts of its authenticity, but its absence from ancient MSS, and from the Syriac Version is noticed in the margin of my Elzevir, 1658. Archbishop Newcome strongly inclines to admit it; he thinks ver. 12 tends to prove it genuine, and he assigns reasons for its omission in some MSS. See *Michaëlis* on the passage, and Middleton's remarks on *τον λιθον*, in his *Doctrine of the Greek Article*\*.

The

\* As I have not noticed this gentleman's *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, in some parts of the following remarks, where it might naturally be expected; I beg leave to observe, that it was not till after much of the work was printed that I had an opportunity of reading the whole of his book, which how-  
ever



The *Primate* and the *Editors* render ver. 56, *πγαλλιασαλο*, "he earnestly desired," which (though they do not cite him,) is strongly recommended by *Blackwall* in his *sacred Classics*, p. 34, published 1725. *Wells* however was before *Blackwall*, who renders it, "your Father Abraham *longed* to see my day." See also *Trapp* on the Gospels.

Chap. IX. *various lections*, in all LXXXIX, affecting the text XVIII; not one of the least importance, most of them noticed in the margin of my *Elzevir*.

Chap. X. *various lections*, in all LXXX, affecting the text XIV, all unimportant. The *Primate* and the *Editors* render *ποιμνη*, ver. 16; *Flock* instead of *Fold*, which as giving a larger sense to the passage is preferable, and is in fact the true meaning of the term.

Chap. XI. *various lections*, in all XCIX, affecting the text XVI, not one of importance.

Chap. XII. *various lections*, in all CVI, affecting the text XVII, all perfectly unimportant.

Chap. XIII. *various lections*, in all LXXIV, affecting the text XVIII, unimportant.

ever was not altogether accidental, for knowing that his Doctrine had already been disputed by some of the party against whom my *Strictures* are directed, particularly by Mr. Jones, in the Appendix to his illustrations of the Gospel, and by Dr. Carpenter, I was determined to keep myself free from any bias that might arise from a doctrine so recently submitted to the public.

Chap.

Chap. XIV. *various lections*, in all LXIX, affecting the the text X, not one of importance.

Chap. XV. *various lections*, in all XLIV, affecting the text VII. *ibid.*

Chap. XVI. *various lections*, in all LXIII, affecting the text XV. *ibid.*

Chap. XVII. *various lections*, in all XLVII, affecting the text XI. Griesbach has  $\zeta$  instead of  $\xi$ , ver. 11, upon which I have made some remarks elsewhere; the rest quite immaterial.

Chap. XVIII. *various lections*, in all LXVI, affecting the text XVI, ver. 1,  $\tau\epsilon$   $\kappa\epsilon\delta\rho\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  for  $\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ . See Middleton on the Article, 373. ver. 15,  $\delta$   $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ ; see Middleton; the Improved Version follows the received text, *another* disciple; Wells, does the same,—ver. 20,  $\omicron\pi\alpha$   $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\theta\epsilon\nu$   $\omicron\iota$   $\iota\sigma\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$ : Griesbach discards  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\theta\epsilon\nu$  and reads  $\pi\alpha\nu\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$ : Wells does the same:  $\pi\alpha\nu\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$  also occurs in the margin of my Elzevir.

Chap. XIX. *various lections*, in all XCVI, affecting the text XXIII, generally quite unimportant, ver. 31, for  $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$   $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\eta$   $\tau\epsilon$   $\Sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\epsilon$ , Griesbach reads  $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\epsilon$ ; see Middleton. Wells, who reads  $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\eta$ , accounts for the high day in his paraphrase.

Chap. XX. *various lections*, in all LXVII, affecting the text XIV. Ver. 8; Newcome and the Editors of the improved Version, have taken advantage of a reading in this verse which I wonder has not been more adopted; they read with the  
Greek

Greek of the *Camb. MS.* *ακ επισημευεν*, and believed *not*; the following verse, as the Primate observes, seems to assign a reason for John's *un-belief*: see however *Doddridge*. *Griesbach* does *not* take *ακ* into his text: the other readings quite unimportant.

Chap. XXI: *various lections*, in all LXVII, affecting the text IX, none of the smallest importance.

The total of the various Readings in this Gospel then amounts to *one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven*, and of those affecting the text, and which therefore I have had occasion to mark, to *three-hundred and forty-two*, not one-fifth of the whole; and of these *three hundred and forty-two* the very utmost that can be said to be of any importance, as far as I am a judge, do not exceed *seven or ten* at furthest\*; and of these, more than half at the least appear to have been noticed an *hundred* or an *hundred and fifty* years ago. I must again declare that I do not bring these facts forward to depreciate the merit of those indefatigable collators and critics who have supplied us with this information, and which extends to many other most important objects, but merely to prevent any fresh alarms, from the large increase of various readings, and the revived report of *improvements* and *corrections* of the sacred text.

\* The three noticed by Mr. Middleton have been added.



I have now nearly brought this long introduction to a conclusion; but I cannot yet dismiss it, without expressing a hope that the cause I plead, will be found to be not that of the established church only, but of many denominations of dissenters. I would even flatter myself that much which I have advanced may be judged nearly to concern the *Jews*, that ancient and most extraordinary people; to whom were committed those "*Oracles of God*," on which the faith of every Christian should be built; "to whom pertains the *adoption*, and the *glory*, and the *covenants*, and the *giving of the law*, and the *service of God*, and the *promises*, whose are the *Fathers*, and of whom as to the *Flesh* Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever."

I should have been happy if I could have adapted my book more immediately to the use and service of the *unlearned*, whom it is my ultimate desire to preserve harmless in this new trial to which they are about to be exposed; but the nature of the publication against which I have directed my Remarks, prevented this, and compelled me to discuss the matter in the way of *criticism*; in which if I should have done but little, or even fallen into mistakes, I ought to be excused if I have done enough to satisfy myself; because this is the liberty and privilege so much insisted upon by our opponents, that *every man* may think for himself and propagate for the behoof of others, whatever he thinks and believes. I am confident that if I should have  
fallen

fallen into any gross error, it will be soon sufficiently detected and pointed out, which has the more emboldened me to make free with what I *conceive to be the errors* of others; for though I am always sorry to find that I am wrong, I wish to meet my opponents upon the most equal terms. I must however claim indulgence for many unavoidable impediments, to which I have been exposed; first, by a most limited command of books; secondly, by an occasional indisposition to proceed with a work, which I knew that many others must be much more competent to undertake, and which I could not myself engage in but to great disadvantages; and thirdly, from my distance from the press, which has tended both to delay the work, and occasion mistakes; not wholly to be prevented by any diligence or attention on the part either of the printer or myself. Some of these *errata*, I shall notice at the foot of this introduction, that any of material importance, may be corrected, before the reader proceeds to the perusal of the work itself. There is one circumstance which requires to be more particularly noticed, as it may continually embarrass the language; most of the following remarks (though not all) being originally written for a public review, have the plural instead of the singular pronoun; it has been impossible in all instances to correct this inconsistency and anomaly of style. I have also (I am aware) made mistakes in citing certain authors, which has arisen from the accidental

dental insertion or omission of their titles in different works or editions of their works, thus Dr. Twells is sometimes called *Mr. T.* and Dr. Carpenter the same, and I may have inadvertently done the like by others, for which I beg to be excused. As I began this Introduction by expressing my dislike of controversy, I shall conclude it with the pathetic words of the admirable *Hooker*, which I would willingly address to those whom these Remarks most concern. “*Far more comfort it were for us (so small is the joy we take in these strifes) to labour under the same yoke, as men that look for the same eternal reward of their labours ; to be enjoined with you in bands of indissoluble love and amity, to live as if our persons being many, our souls were but one, rather than in such dismembered sort, to spend our few and wretched days in a tedious prosecuting of wearisome contentions.*”





## ERRATA, ADDENDA, &c.

- Page 8, line 12, *for* Corinthians, *read* Cerinthians,  
 30, 26, — *than read* that  
 33, — *keep in read* keep them in  
 48, *add to note* †. The conjecture of certain commen-  
 tators, that the mariners who made this declaration  
 were Pagans, seems to be wholly without support.  
 See Middleton on the Greek Article, p. 228.  
 62, line 19, *for* Evangelists, *read* Evangelist,  
 30, — understood — undertook  
 89, 26, *insert* with *before* God,  
 92, 6, *note, for* metonymy; *read* metonymy;  
 13 from bottom, *for* iv. *read* vi.  
 99, last line of note, *for* Siai. *read* Sinai.  
 108, line 26, *before* covenant *insert* the  
 122, 25, *for* Christia *read* Christi à  
 129, 19, *omit* " at the end of the line  
 135, 9, *note, for* quoquis *read* quoque  
 137, *add to note* †. The learned Professor's remarks on  
 the term Punishment, as applied to the sufferings of  
 Christ, deserve to be considered. See Vol. II. p.  
 62—63.  
 138, line 18, *for* convenere *read* convenire  
 144, 4, *note, for* παρακλητω *read* παρακλητω  
 5, *ibid.* — αφθωνα τατων *read* αφθουρωτατων  
 172, line 29, *for* expressed *read* expresses  
 191, 3, — ye *read* yet  
 199, last line of note, *for* of *read* in





## REMARKS, &c.

---

THIS Version of the New Testament, published as the *title-page* sets forth, “By a Society for promoting *Christian Knowledge*, and the practice of virtue by the *Distribution of Books*,” demands particular consideration. If it really is so improved a version as it is stated to be; if the text is carefully corrected, as it is pretended; but above all, if the accompanying notes are properly illustrative of the Christian doctrines, then not only all the members of the established church of these realms, but almost every denomination of Dissenters from the establishment are extravagantly wrong. Calvinists, Arminians, Baptists, Anabaptists, Quakers, Papists, nay, even Arians, Semi-Arians, and Socinians, all are in a gross error; those only may be held to be right who are the immediate disciples of the following contemporary authorities: Dr. Priestley, Mr. Wakefield, Mr. Lindsey, Mr. Evanson, Mr. Jones, and the several unitarian contributors to the Theological Repository \*. For though Archbishop

\* Some distinctions seem necessary here, which we cannot take upon us to settle. The *general* Baptists are, we believe, regarded as Unitarians; and from a note in the Monthly Repository for July last, we learn that low Arianism is considered as entitled to that distinction, though, “in *strictness of speech*, the latter ought to be confined entirely to the belief of the simple humanity of our Lord.” The authors, besides, upon whose authority they chiefly rely, are by no means to be considered as

bishop Newcome is held out as a sort of model in the title-page, his authority is made light of, whenever it appears to be much against them; and we are expressly told in a note on the first Epistle of St. John, that nothing but "the clear and discriminating light diffused over the obscurities of the sacred Scriptures by the venerable Theophilus Lindsey, and his coadjutors Jebb, Priestley, Wakefield, and others," could "purify the Christian Religion from those numerous and enormous corruption which have so long disfigured its doctrines and impeded its progress." This is speaking out plainly, though it rather surprises me that none of these names appear in the title-page to recommend the book, while *two* Archbishops are selected for this purpose; for besides the learned *Primate* of Ireland, a motto is adopted from *Archbishop* Parker's Preface to the *Bishop's Bible*, by way surely of a second decoy, to the unwary members of the Church; I can hardly bring myself to consider this circumstance in any other light.

In their Introduction, the Editors boast of the encouragement they have received, from the *liberal* and *enlightened*. How much could I wish that all *such* terms could be avoided. It is thus

in perfect agreement upon all points—many things are to be found in Dr. Priestley's writings, especially in his Posthumous Notes on the Bible, not by any means accordant with the general spirit of this edition, and so much at variance do Mr. Jones and Mr. Evanson appear to be, that in a work lately published by the former, he with considerable reason, in my opinion, speaks of the "surprising ignorance and temerity displayed by the latter in some of his Scripture Comments." Many circumstances indeed concur to induce me to think that a considerable variety of opinions prevails among the Unitarians, in regard to the conduct and management of this new version; for further improvements of this *improved* translation, and further correction of this newly *corrected* text are already called for, by their own friends.

that

that a noun adjective is often made to contain an argument. If those are the only *enlightened* who would encourage the sale and distribution of this edition, all criticism is superseded—I must incur the charge of dulness and ignorance for merely attempting it, and certainly of illiberality for presuming to undeceive the public. The title-page contains many bold assumptions of this nature. The Version is declared to be an *improved* one, the Text a *corrected* one, and the object of the Society is stated to be, the Promotion of *Christian* Knowledge. I am not bound to bow down to authorities any more than the Editors themselves, and shall therefore freely declare, I deny all these assumptions; I think the Version *not* an *improved* one, the Text *not correct*\*, and the knowledge it would promote, not truly *Christian*. I must take my chance of being expelled from the society of *inquisitive, liberal, and judicious* scholars; of *candid and discerning* readers; of *learned, acute, and even honest* critics; of *serious and enlightened* Christians: this I cannot help. I shall endeavour to *hold fast the form of sound words*, delivered to us by the sacred writers, in hopes of saving both myself, and those who will honour me with their attention.

It is not my design, however, to enter upon a

\* It has in fact no determinate basis or standard. Its deviations from Newcome (which in all are calculated to amount to 750) from the received text, and from Griesbach's 2d edition (*not duly noticed or pointed out to the reader as they ought to be*), are with much pains and great candor exhibited at length by an Unitarian Reviewer, in the Monthly Repository for March, April, July, and October, 1809. This learned writer regrets, that no standard text has been adhered to, "because," says he, "it would do away one of the most powerful charges brought against us, namely, that we alter the Scriptures to suit our own system."



minute examination of the version merely as such, but rather to dwell upon those doctrines attempted to be set aside as *vulgar errors*; such as the *pre-existence* and *miraculous conception* of Christ—the *divinity* and *personality* of the Son and *Holy Ghost*—the existence of *evil spirits* and *angels*—and the *atonement* by the *blood* of Christ. I do not propose to be equally diffuse on all these points, but upon some I cannot avoid having much to say; I shall begin with what happens to occur the earliest in this book of God; namely, the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The accounts of the miraculous conception and birth of our Saviour have a strong mark of suspicion put upon them. The whole of the narratives from verse 16 of the first chapter of St. Matthew to the end of the second chapter, and from verse 4 of the first chapter to the end of the second of St. Luke, is printed in *italics*, “to *shew* that it is of *doubtful authority*.” The reasons for this are given in the notes at the foot of the pages. I shall endeavour to bring them all together, that a full view of the subject may be taken at once. The references in these notes point out to us the sources whence the editors have deduced their arguments, and I may reasonably conclude that they have of course selected the strongest proofs in vindication of their own suspicions. The first note on St. Matthew begins with telling us, that “Epiphanius says, that Cerinthus and Carpocrates, *who used the Gospel of the Ebionites*, which was probably the original Gospel of St. Matthew, written in the Hebrew language for the use of the Jewish believers, argued from the genealogy at the beginning of the Gospel, that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary: but that the Ebionites had *taken away* even the genealogy, beginning the Gospel with these words,

words, ‘And it came to pass in the days of Herod the king, &c.’ “It is probable, therefore,” say the Editors, “that the first sixteen verses of this chapter are genuine, and that they were found at least in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates. And indeed, it can hardly be supposed that an author writing for the instruction of Hebrew Christians, would have omitted to trace the descent of Christ from Abraham and David, upon which they justly laid so great a stress.”

Here must surely be some mistake; the genealogy is probably genuine, because Cerinthus and Carpocrates argued from it that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary, and must therefore have had it in *their* copies, though it appears they *used the Gospel of the Ebionites*, who had expressly *taken the genealogy away!* Nay, “even the genealogy;” therefore, probably, in Epiphanius’s opinion, something else; and what could this be, that should intervene between the genealogy and the words “and it came to pass in the days of Herod,” but the account of the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus?

Whatever had been *taken away* should in propriety be carefully restored, and though I am not prepared to say that the Editors have given an exact account of matters (for if they have, they have strangely confounded their own argument), yet I am very sure that Epiphanius does talk about things *taken away and erased\** by the Ebionites, if not by the Nazarenes also. If the genealogy was by any, *taken away*, it is plain that, in the Editors’ opinion, Cerinthus and Carpocrates were ill used, who had made use of it, to prove that Jesus was

\* *Ἀρραβάν* and *ἀρραβανίσαι* are the words used by Epiphanius.

the offspring of Joseph and Mary, and of course *a mere man*; and we shall venture to surmise, that those who would argue from the account of the miraculous conception that he was *more than man*, are quite as ill used by those, who would, in these days, attempt to *take away* those parts of Scripture in which this is related. It is impossible not to be struck with the little credit due to the authorities cited. By the statement of the Editors, the Ebionites seem to be clearly convicted of *taking away* one portion at least of *genuine Scripture*. If not so, then their other authorities, Cerinthus and Carpocrates, must be accounted guilty of drawing their arguments in proof of the mere humanity of Jesus from a forged genealogy. Either way their authorities are to be suspected; the Ebionites of a fraudulent erasure, or the Cerinthians and Carpocratians of an unwarrantable insertion. To bring these forward as joint evidences, in a case where they appear to have differed so remarkably, would look like a sad oversight, were it possible for us to be blind to the policy of such a step in persons of the Editors sentiments. The Ebionites are right in the eyes of all Unitarians for rejecting the account of the miraculous conception, which makes Jesus the Son of God, but not right in rejecting the genealogy, because it helps to prove, among the Cerinthians and Carpocratians of the present day, that Jesus was only the son of Joseph.

That the narratives are severally to be found in all the manuscripts and versions now extant, the  
Editors

\* I find an admirable remark in the Review of the Improved Version in the Theological Repository, for March, 1809, on the inconsistency of the Editors in venturing to mark these parts of Scripture as doubtful against the preponderating evidence



Editors acknowledge\*, only they happen to know that they were wanting in the copies used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, *that is (say they)* by the antient Hebrew christians. The Nazarenes and Ebionites of Epiphanius happen not to have been the antient Hebrew christians, a point so fully proved by Bishop Horsley against Dr. Priestley, that we need merely refer the reader to his tracts and disquisitions upon the subject, and pass on to other parts of the note before us. “It is hardly to be supposed, that an author writing for the instruction of Hebrew christians, would have omitted to trace the descent of Christ from Abraham and David.” This I freely grant; it is not likely. The genealogy is in its proper place, and indispensably necessary to the gospel of which it forms a part. But, I must have leave to add, that it is quite as *hardly to be supposed* that an author writing for the instruction of *Hebrew* christians should omit to show that the Messiah was born at *Bethlehem in Judea*. I say, not “*of a virgin*,” though this might well be added, but at present I shall only insist upon the former circumstance. This to Hebrew christians was quite as necessary as the genealogy; for we find by reference to John vii. 42, (a passage

dence of manuscripts, versions, and quotations; “we see in this,” says the learned Reviewer, “a tendency to conjectural emendation, the traces of which we would wish to have been confined to the notes.” It should also be here observed, that *Newcome*, in referring to Dr. Campbell’s note on the authenticity of the two first chapters of Matthew, adds, “which appears to me to be established beyond reasonable doubt.” The learned writer in the Repository, has also some very just remarks on the ambiguity of the editor’s *italics*, as not properly indicative of the *degree* of doubt attending the passages so marked, and which must therefore have a great tendency to mislead.

(a passage not disputed by the Editors) that even those who judged our Saviour to be a Galilean by birth as well as residence, knew that the Messiah, the Christ, *ought to be born* at Bethlehem. Therefore, all things considered, the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew would have been grievously and essentially defective without some testimony of this sort, the Hebrews themselves being judges—But to return again to the note.

All the evidence adduced from Epiphanius, about the Gospels of the Nazarenes, Ebionites, Corinthians, and Carpocratians, as defective in these particulars, is nothing in comparison with the argument that follows, and which, if admissible, must needs settle the question. “The 18th verse begins,” say the Editors, “a new story, which continues to the end of the second chapter. This *could not have been* written (this is certainly coming to the point), this *could not have been* written by the Author of the Genealogy, for it *contradicts* his design, which was to prove that Jesus, being the son of Joseph, was the descendant of Abraham and David; whereas the design of this *narrative* is to shew that Joseph was *not* his real father.—This account therefore of the miraculous conception of Jesus, *must have been wanting* in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates, as well as in those of the Ebionites: and if the Genealogy be genuine, this narrative *must be* spurious.” This is decisive: nothing surely can be advanced against such a discovery. And yet to upset the whole of it, we need not go far, the Editors themselves have amply supplied us with an answer to all this, in Mark, ch. vii. 38. The Editors, without hesitation, admit the following reading: “Of him the *son of man* also shall be ashamed, when he cometh in the  
glory

glory of his father, with the holy angels." Whom do they here account the *father* of the *son* of man? —They also freely admit the following passage: Mark xiv. 61, 62. "Again the High Priest asked him, and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the *son* of the blessed God? And Jesus said, *I am*; and ye will see the *son* of MAN sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of Heaven."—Could these things have been written, let us ask, by those who really judged our Lord to be *only* the son of man? Is not the contradiction as glaring in one instance as the other. The Editors perhaps will say no.—One is literal and the other figurative.—One speaks of a son of God, the other of a person born of the Holy Ghost. This I shall not stop to settle. It is sufficient for our purposes to turn over only one leaf, with the Editors, and take their own words. For there we are actually told, (*and it is urged upon us as a forcible argument*), that *had* the account of the miraculous conception been a genuine narrative, it *could not have been unacceptable* to the Ebionites, nor would it *at all have militated against the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ*, which was universally held by the *Jewish christians*, (see before), it being a fact analogous to the miraculous birth of Isaac, Samuel, and other eminent persons of the Hebrew nation."

This analogy, in all its bearing, we entirely deny; but shall not dwell on it. It is enough to point out the inconsistency alluded to. We are told on one side of the leaf, that if the account of the descent from Joseph be true, the account of the miraculous conception by the Holy Spirit must be spurious, and yet on the other side only of the very same leaf we are told that such miraculous conception



conception does *not interfere* with his proper humanity. With such critics and such reasoners, how can we stir a step? In the last place, however, we agree with them,—for we do not think that the miraculous conception *does* interfere with the proper humanity of Christ. We fully think he was man, and the son of man, though born by the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit. We think his genealogy quite as applicable to his mother as to his reputed father. The laws of the Jews made these matters identical and reciprocal.

If Joseph was the husband of Mary, it has always been pretty generally allowed, that he *could not have been so*, had he not been exactly of the same tribe and family as herself, and if so, the genealogy applies to both: and of Mary he was most indisputably born. There is no commentator of any repute, antient or modern, to whom we might not refer to settle this point. Mary's pedigree and descent was involved in that of her husband Joseph; and “an Author writing for the instruction of HEBREW christians,” must have known this.

The note next proceeds to say, that if it be true as Luke relates, Chap. iii. 23, that Jesus was entering upon his thirtieth year (see Wakefield's Translation) in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, he *must have been* born two years at least after the death of Herod, “a circumstance which alone invalidates the whole story.” See Lardner's Works, Vol. I. p. 432. Here again they come most decisively to the point. We should at least suppose that this “*must have been*” has the sanction of the great authority they cite, and yet, Lardner (to whom they so very confidently refer) actually enters upon this very difficulty, with the following remark;

“ It

“It may be made appear *several ways*, that Jesus was born *above a year*, probably *above two years*, before Herod died!” So that I here shall beg leave to join in the reference, and intreat the reader to turn to Lardner, and see how ably and satisfactorily he combats the difficulty, and in *how many ways* he unravels the mystery.

I make this reference with the less scruple because their own model, Archbishop Newcome does so too. He expressly sends us to Lardner, not to confirm the difficulty but to solve it. See his note on Luke, iii. 1.

We are next told in these notes on St. Matthew (for those on St. Luke are still to come) that “it is indeed highly improbable that no notice should have been taken of these extraordinary events by any contemporary writer; that no expectation should have been excited by them; and that no allusion should have been made to them in any other passage of Scripture.” I would ask what contemporary writer was there to notice them? Josephus was not born till many years after, and he had great reason for suppressing such relations. See Archbishop Newcome’s note and references on Matthew ii. 18. Could any author be particularly named that was so situated and circumstanced as to be likely to record such transactions, the Evangelists excepted. Though indeed it should be noticed that the Unitarians often intimate that these accounts were borrowed from the spurious Gospels and narratives relating to Jesus particularly, and his Virgin Mother. Such histories were certainly written, and by contemporary authors, but it remains to be proved that, extravagant as they were, they had yet no foundation whatever in truth. The “*Gospel of the infancy of Jesus*,” and  
the

the "*Gospel of the birth of Mary*," are titles that rather imply the actual truth of the accounts in Matthew and Luke\*. Why take the trouble of going back to the very infancy of Jesus, or why dwell upon the birth of Mary, if as an infant Jesus was generally held to have been merely such, and Mary but a common mother. Why not write a Gospel of the birth of Joseph as well as Mary, or of the infancy of John the Baptist? It cannot however be pretended that no contemporary writer noticed these events. The censual tables and public records of the Empire may be said to have borne some testimony to them. The temporary sojournment of the parents of Jesus at Bethlehem, accords so particularly and so remarkably with the Prophecies relating to the birth of the Messiah, that this event alone is as extraordinary and providential as any, and this appears to have been expressly registered. I must confess that the appeals made by Justin Martyr and Tertullian to the public registers of the Empire, and the particular mention of these evidences by St. Chrysostom, fully satisfy me that something of the kind notoriously existed.

As for the expectations excited, if the account is but true, there were many such. The visit of the Magi, the alarm of Herod, the astonishment of the Shepherds, the Prophecies of Simeon and Anna are surely remarkable enough. That great

\* See my Letter to Mr. Stone. Dr. Priestley, in his Posthumous Work, (Notes on the Bible), observes, that the *spurious* Gospels were written *after* the genuine ones, and "in imitation of the four generally received." See Vol. III. p. 10. It would seem then that my conjecture is not unreasonable. The *genuine* narratives of the miraculous conception, might naturally lead to the publication of the Gospels of the infancy of Jesus, the birth of Mary, &c. But if not genuine, why attempt to ascend higher than the inspired Evangelists?

opponent of Christianity, Mr. Collins, in his Scheme of literal Prophecy, admits that very extraordinary expectations were raised by the birth of Jesus\*. He expressly mentions, the opinion of the Virgin Mary, that the child with which she was big should help Israel. He mentions and dwells upon the Prophecy of Zacharias, who declares that that child was the person spoken of by the Prophets, who should "save Israel from their enemies, and from the hand of all that hated them." He speaks also of the insurrections of the Jews in consequence of such expectations, and other matters.

But in my opinion *St. Luke's* account is at once a sufficient answer to all such objections. The conduct of the Virgin mother is described in a very striking manner, and is exactly such as we might expect and suppose, if we consider that it was manifestly among the purposes of God, not fully to reveal the Messiah, 'till a long time afterwards.

She is represented as doubtful in some degree, and yet by no means disposed to question the interposition of Providence. Upon the report made by the shepherds that they had been favoured with an angelic vision concerning the child, "all that heard it," we are informed, "*wondered* at those things which were told them by the shepherds." "But," it is added, "MARY kept all these things in memory, considering them in her heart," a circumstance particularly repeated upon the extraordinary occasion of his being found, when only 12 years of age, among the teachers in the Temple.

Were such events to occur in our days at the birth of any child, no doubt we should be inclined to think, the story would spread rapidly, and not

\* See also Newcome's note on Luke, ii. 25.



be easily forgotten. But the miraculous occurrences, the signs and visions vouchsafed under the Jewish polity, had made such matters too familiar, to admit of so general a surprise, as *we* might apprehend would be the case. The Jews of those days were particularly disposed to dispute all miracles; those that they even saw our Saviour perform, they referred to magic. “*Nihil non nugacissimi fingunt,*” (says *Vorstius*, of the Jews in after times; and the same might have been applied to many of those who lived during our Saviour’s appearance in the flesh.) “These egregious triflers invent any thing to avoid being obliged to confess that our Jesus performed his miracles by the power, and, as it were, the finger of God.” So far from attending much to the circumstances that accompanied our Lord’s birth, most of his contemporaries were more likely to have turned away from those who testified of such matters, while his low birth and early sufferings must even have been offensive to those whose expectations of a temporal deliverer had been excited by the Prophets.

To Abraham and Sarah, as well as to Joseph and Mary, much was revealed of the future fortunes of their son; much that was quite out of the course of nature, (as these Editors admit), attended the birth of Isaac; yet we do not find that the eyes of the world in general were fixed upon him, or that even his own parents fully understood the whole purport of the promises and signs vouchsafed them. Herod does not appear to have been ever certified whether Jesus was cut off among the infants slaughtered at Bethlehem. The angel that warned his parents to flee with him into Egypt, we may be very certain, did not appear or make known his errand to Herod, or any others at Jerusalem. This was evidently done secretly, and whatever construction

we may be disposed to put upon the vision, it plainly shows that, in the opinion of the writer, an open and general manifestation of the Messiah was *at that time* by no means intended.

It appears from the history of our Lord, that thirty years were to elapse before he entered upon his ministry. During this period, it seems to have been requisite, that so far from his being generally made known, God should even “ exert his divine power,” (as the Editors remark upon another occasion) “ To restrain men *from so beholding him* as to know him.” We are reminded by the Editors themselves, that there was a tradition among the Jews, that after the Messiah should be born, he would be conveyed away and miraculously concealed ’till Elias came to reveal and anoint him. The Jews would refer this to some future coming of the real Elias, but if we apply it to the Baptist, as we are justified in doing, it comes nigh to the truth.

Though, however, a temporary concealment and obscurity seem to have been thus entirely consistent with the purposes of God, yet in order that all the Prophecies should meet in him, and him alone, such occurrences as are related to have taken place, were indispensable to the grand scheme of the Christian dispensation. His birth and birth-place required to be marked and distinguished by peculiar evidences: all which, as I observed before, is remarkably confirmed, by the representation given us of Mary’s conduct. SHE, we are told, noticed and regarded all that passed with wonder and astonishment, by no means so carelessly, as to suffer any thing to escape her observation. She kept every thing in *her memory*, “ *pondering them in her heart.*” Mary survived her Son, and must needs have been questioned about his birth and childhood, when his ministry and miracles, sufferings, death

death and resurrection, became matters of so great interest to his followers. Now the account given by the Evangelists seems to be exactly such an account as the mother of our Lord would have given. All the extraordinary events, as they occurred, are mentioned, as matters which at the time excited wonder and amazement, mixed with a becoming resignation to the will of God, and submission to his dispensations. She praised God, it seems, for the appearances vouchsafed, and pondered every thing in her heart, but still waited for farther revelations. One incident occurred during his childhood which particularly drew her attention: at twelve years of age, she found him sitting among the teachers in the Temple, both hearing them, and asking them questions; every one being astonished at his understanding and answers. This then set her again considering. "She kept," we are told, "all these things also in her heart\*:" nor should it be omitted, that our Saviour's reply to her on this occasion seems to carry in it an allusion to the miraculous conception, "Knewye not that I must needs be in my FATHERS house." It is added indeed, that his parents understood not the thing which he spake unto them. But the force of the Greek term συνιεναι, as well as of the correspondent Latin term *intelleverunt*, is, that they did not *perfectly* and *entirely* apprehend all that he intended by the speech, (see Leigh's *Critica Sacra*, Doddridge, &c.) And this agrees therefore with the imperfect knowledge they then had of God's designs. That they might have understood it in part, our Lord's own words express-

\* Grotius upon this says, "Quod ideo videtur a Luca expressum quia ipsam habebat harum narrationum auctorem."

ly imply. That Mary attained to a full understanding of his divine powers, even before they were openly exerted, is evident from her behaviour at the marriage feast at Cana, and the directions she gave as *preparatory* to his *first* miracle. During his minority, and private conversation, as he wrought no miracles, his conduct and character must needs have been less noticeable: but when the events of his life and ministry were to be recorded, who could more exactly supply the materials relating to his birth, infancy, and childhood, than his mother, and who could doubt her testimony after the resurrection and ascension of her crucified son?

I have dwelt the longer on this, because to those who have not time or disposition to examine thoroughly into matters, the objection may appear to have some degree of plausibility; whereas the *slight* expectation excited, and the *little* notice taken of Jesus before his baptism, were particularly consistent with the views of Providence.

That no allusion is made to these extraordinary events in any other passage of the sacred writings, (the next objection of the Editors) and that the reasoning from the prophecies of the Old Testament are inconclusive, are mere pretences. The reasoning from the prophecies of the Old Testament must have been conclusive to the extent that the writer intended, whether he was an impostor or inspired; and though expositors should differ for ever as to the precise manner in which the events and the prophecies are to be accommodated to each other, no difficulty of this kind can tend to prove the narrative not genuine. But the fact is, that to many wise men, and most profound scholars, the reasoning has been held to be most strikingly conclusive,



conclusive, and therefore no bare assertion to the contrary can be any subject of criticism. (See, among other writers, Bishop Kidder's *Demonstration of the Messiah*; Jenkin's Reasonableness of the Christian Religion; Leslie's Method with the *Jews and Deists*; Leland's *Deistical Writers*, &c. &c. &c.)

The other objection, that no allusion is made to the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus in any other passages of Scripture, depends entirely upon the construction put upon various passages which might be selected. To an Unitarian, such expressions as "God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh;" "The WORD was made flesh, and dwelt among us;" "God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law;" may seem to carry in them no allusion to any thing out of the common course of things; but to those who believe the accounts of the miraculous conception of Jesus, nothing can be more direct and conclusive than such references. It is a mere begging of the question then to pretend that no such allusions exist\*. If the narrative be true, all these expressions are the strongest allusions possible; if it be not true, they are as near as can be totally unintelligible. The Editors are careful enough to prevent, if they can, any such impressions. They add a note on Gal. iv. 4. expressly to inform the world, that "born of a woman," bears no allusion to the *supposed* miraculous conception of Christ. It is a common Jewish phrase to express a proper

\* Unitarians themselves seem to admit this, in the most recent publications of Mr. Belsham and Dr. Carpenter, I find it very justly acknowledged, that supposing the doctrines of Christ's pre-existence and superior nature to be true, the Scriptures undoubtedly contain expressions that may fairly be held to countenance such opinions.

human being; and they refer us to many passages of Job to prove this.

Now a common Jewish phrase must have been too general to express that person who was to be, in a most peculiar manner, *the seed of the woman*, who was to bruise the serpent's head. This prophecy can never be done away, nor its application to him about whom Paul was writing: but Tertullian would have accused the Editors of a trick in rendering it "*born of a woman*;" the received text is "*made of a woman*"—"Paulus grammaticis istis," says Tertullian, "silentium imponit, inquires, misit Deus filium suum FACTUM EX MULIERE. Nunquid per mulierem vel in mulierem? Hoc quidem impressius, quod FACTUM potius dicit quam NATUM. FACTUM autem dicendo, et verbum caro factum est, consignavit; et carnis veritatem ex virgine factam asseveravit." The Editors may cite against this, we are aware, both Cyprian and Augustine, who read it "*born*," *natum*: but the *Syriac* Version, and the *Vulgate*, support the common reading; and Beza declares, that in his opinion "*certè expositio vera est.*" But to return from this digression.

It is next insisted upon, that "if the account be true, the proper name of Jesus, according to the uniform custom of the Jews\*, would have been "*Jesus of Bethlehem*," not "*Jesus of Nazareth*." This then, I am sorry to say, can only be considered as a plain declaration on the part of the Editors, that our Saviour was *not* born at Bethlehem, and therefore to all intents and purposes not

\* This is very questionable. See Newcome's note on Acts xx. 4. where he particularly instances the case of our Lord's being called Jesus of Nazareth. to prove that Gaius might, from residence, reasonably be called a Macedonian, though he was *born* at Derbe in Lycaonia.

the Messiah. For it appears to have been generally held that the Messiah should not only "come of the seed of David, but out of the town of Bethlehem where David was," as it is expressed John vii. 42, with reference, no doubt, to Micah v. 2. which the Chaldee Paraphraſt expreſſly applies alſo to the Meſſiah. And this alone is a great proof of the authenticity of St. Matthew's account; for what other record is there to be produced to ſhow that he answered this criterion. The cenſual tables, if they exiſted to the time of Chryſoſtom, as has been alledged, are certainly not now to be appealed to. The Editors conjecture ſome early *Gentile* convert might be the Author of the fiction, who hoped, by elevating the dignity of the founder, to abate the popular prejudice againſt the ſect. They might much more reaſonably ſuſpect ſome Jewish convert: the fact being abſolutely neceſſary to the proof of his being the Meſſiah. Indeed ſuch a proof and testimony is *ſo neceſſary*, that the Scripture would not be fulfilled without it.

There is nothing Unitarians are more ready to do than to ſend the Trinitarians to the Jews, in order to try upon them the effect of their opinions: and it was but the other day that the world was, in a moſt ſtrange manner, called upon to acknowledge the principle, that Jewish prophecy is the ſole criterion of genuine Chriſtian Scripture. Let us then, in this caſe, have leave to refer the Editors and encouragers of this improved verſion, to the Jews: let them tell *them* that the Meſſiah was *not* born at Bethlehem. If any modern Jews give up this criterion, we will venture to ſay they are not proper Jews; and if any Chriſtians abandon the hiſtory, they are not proper Chriſtians. The Chief Priests and Pharisees confirmed the matter alſo negatively, declaring it to be contrary to their hiſtory or traditions

tions that the Messiah should be a Galilean. Therefore if Jesus was *not* born at *Bethlehem*, we have the testimony of the contemporary Jews that he could not be the Messiah; and we have also the testimony of the Chief Priests and Pharisees, that if he *was* born at *Nazareth*, it would be contrary at least to their history and traditions, (if not expressly to their prophecies \*) to receive him as such. I have of course not insisted upon the answer given to Herod by the Chief Priests and Scribes, (Matth. ii. 5.) as not being of sufficient authority in the estimation of the Editors.

But it seems our Lord is repeatedly spoken of in

\* The expression search and look seems as if they referred to the prophecies upon this point, which, indeed is scarcely to be questioned, when prophecies relative to the birth-place of Christ were plainly supposed to exist, as that of Micah. They overlooked one thing, namely, that the Prophets in general had intimated that he should be called in contempt and scorn a *Nazarene*, as many able commentators explain, Matth. ii. 23. The taunt against him, therefore, for being a Nazarene, was consistent with this intimation of the prophets, for that this was no express prophecy, but an intimation rather, seems plain from the Evangelist's terms; " *Ἡὰν ῥητοὶς Ναζωραῖος κληθῆσθαι* non sunt alicujus veteris prophetæ verba, sed Evangelistæ Matthæi; referri enim debent non ad τὸ ρηθῆναι, sed ad τὸ κληρωθῆναι. Quomodo quod per prophetas prædictum est de eo, propterea implebitur quod habitavit in Nazareth? Quia Nazarenus, inde acceptâ occasione vocabitur: quo nomine varia variorum prophetarum vaticinia implentur ac typi." Vid. Alex. Mori. Not. ad Quædam Loca Novi Fœderis. Paris. 1668.

I am reminded by a learned correspondent, that Jerome translating from the Nazarene Gospel has "*Quoniam Nazareus vocabitur.*" See Michaelis, vol. 3, p. 167, edit, 1801.

A circumstance more particularly to be noticed, because, as Mr. Marsh ably observes, it amounts to a proof that Jerome, who transcribed the Nazarene Gospel, actually quotes from it the 2d ch. of Matthew, and yet he is expressly cited by the Editors as a joint evidence with Epiphanius, that these chapters were wanting in the Gospels of the Nazarenes and Ebionites.

the



the Gospels, as "the son of Joseph, without any intimation on the part of the historian, that this language is incorrect. And here we have the usual Unitarian references, viz. Matth. xiii. 55. Luke iv. 22. John i. 45. vi. 42. In every one of which passages, though indeed no parenthesis tells us, on the part of the historian, that the language is incorrect, the context intimates, as plainly as possible, that he was something far higher than the mere "son of Joseph." One historian, however, whose particular testimony is not among the above references, though it is only a few verses above what they do cite, has always been held to intimate, (by a certain parenthesis) that the title of "son of Joseph," was not altogether correct. The Unitarians have always been in the habit of expunging or altering this text. The present Editors adopt the latter method. Instead of the received reading of Luke iii. 23. "being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, they read, being, (as was allowed by law) the son of Joseph, i. e. say they, entered in the public registers;" and Pearce is cited in proof of this.

If those public registers stated that Jesus was the son of Joseph, they probably stated also that he was born at Bethlehem, and were in fact those very registers or censual tables referred to by Justin and Tertullian, in proof of the very point in dispute. That these tables or registers should describe him as the son of Joseph is quite regular, he being the husband of his mother Mary, though his birth and conception might nevertheless be miraculous; but at all events, and let either rendering be received, one may as fairly be understood as a qualification of the expression as the other. By the Unitarians own account, the notoriety of his connection with Joseph was such as to need no appeal  
to

to the register for such a simple fact. If then the account of the miraculous conception be but true, the parenthesis, even as the Editors render it, is just as strong. It would then run thus, "and Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (not actually, but as he is described in the registers) the son of Joseph, who was the son of Heli." The latter member of which clause deserves particular notice, because it serves to show, (in the estimation of most commentators), that the pedigree is immediately carried from the imputed or "*supposed*" father, into his mother's family. The endeavour to do away the received rendering\*, is a tacit acknowledgment of the strong sense it conveys, and as it has the sanction of ancient versions, and the consent of most able critics, it may be still not only defended, but insisted upon. The rendering of the Editors ("as was allowed by law"), happens particularly to militate against Grotius's argument in refutation of Africanus, who supposed that Luke gave the *legal*, Matthew the *natural* genealogy. Grotius contends that the case is exactly the reverse. That Matthew gives the legal, Luke the natural pedigree; and there-

\* See Greisbach's note on Luke iii. 23, where the common rendering, "as was supposed," receives great support. Both Newcome and Wakefield adopted it, as the Editors admit. In the Monthly Repository for October, 1809, a correspondent, who signs himself Theologus, contends that *ὡς ὅτι ἐνομίζετο υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ*, means *ὡς*, being *in reality*, as he was supposed to be, the son of Joseph; but the question returns, against whom is such an asseveration supposed to be advanced; *what doubts* existed upon this head? for that it implies a doubt is evident, and indeed the writer himself admits it, when he says it alludes to the narrative, ch. iv. 22. The observation there recorded, "is not this Joseph's son," is surely as much as to say, how comes this man, if he is merely Joseph's son, to utter such gracious words, so much above our expectations, and so wonderful. See the place.

fore that *ενομιζέτο*, if it signified any reference to the registers, should have been adopted by Matthew, and Matthew's term *εγεννησε* been transferred to Luke; but, as he justly remarks, "*Quod vim vocum attinet, primum illud ενομιζέτο non ad totum stemmatis contextum pertinet, sed ad Jesum solum, qui Josephi filius non erat, sed vulgo putabatur.*"

There has been another parenthesis proposed, which deserves consideration. "Jesus (being as was supposed the son of Joseph) of Heli," i. e. "Jesus (who was supposed to be the son of Joseph) was the son (or grandson) of Heli." This would particularly accord with the original, *ὁ Ἰησους —ων, ὡς ενομιζέτο, υἱος Ἰωσηφ, τε Ἡλι*. As there are no parentheses expressed in ancient MSS. it must be left to the judgment of every reader how he places them; but, according to the common reading, Joseph and Heli are so conjoined as to appear to be son and father, which was not the very fact, except as son-in-law and father-in-law, which however would do. But the term *υἱος* is not repeated before *Ἡλι* in the Greek, as the common version has it, and as the Editors read it: and as neither Joseph nor Jesus were directly the sons of Heli, the truth would be best expressed by marking only the descent of Jesus from Heli. (See Kidder's Demonstration, and Trapp on the Gospels.) Luke as a Gentile, writing for the instruction of Gentiles, might with propriety go into the mother's family, which Matthew was precluded doing, as not customary with the Jews. With them it was a rule, that "the family of the mother is not called a family:" but it should be noticed, as Bishop Kidder suggests, that on this very account, possibly, Jesus was ordained to be conceived, not of a free, but of an espoused virgin, that by the family  
of

of Joseph, the family of Mary might be known; and he cites Cotelierius in Epist. Ignatii ad Ephes. who hath collected several places to this purpose \*.

I have now regularly considered the reasons stated in the two notes on St. Matthew, for printing his account of the miraculous conception in Italic characters, as being of doubtful authority. It remains to examine those in the same manner, which accompany the correspondent narrative in St. Luke. Upon these however I need not be so long, as most of them are answered in the replies already given. St. Luke's narrative is equally allowed to be extant in all the MSS. and versions at present known. It is again confidently stated that Herod *must have been dead* two years before our Saviour was born †, and Lardner is again quoted, as it were, in proof of this. Here is some parade of dates in confirmation of the matter, all which are so ably discussed by Lardner, that we can only desire again to join in the reference; begging that no reader will take things upon trust, but examine for themselves, for two circumstances are here notoriously assumed, which cannot in any

\* Having just treated of parentheses, we cannot avoid giving a reading of Luke i. 26, suggested by the Bishop, and which happens to be supported by the express testimony of Chrysostom and Nicetas. Instead of "Gabriel was sent to a virgin espoused to a man, whose name was Joseph, of the house of David, and the virgin's name was Mary," he proposes to read, "to a virgin (espoused to a man whose name was Joseph) of the house of David," connecting the latter clause with "virgin;" which the Greek admits, and for which he gives many good reasons.

† It is actually a third time insisted on in a note on Luke iii. 23.



manner be proved. First, that the fifteenth year of Tiberius's reign is to be dated from the death of Augustus, whereas in *all likelihood* his proconsular authority is to be included. Secondly, that the date of the death of Herod is capable of being ascertained, which their own indefatigable referee, the learned Lardner, acknowledges he was unable in any manner to determine.

The Editors say, the latest period assigned is the Spring, A. U. C. 751. Now this is certainly not true. Possinus in his *Spicilegium Evangelicum*, edited by that great scholar Fabricius, endeavouring to settle as he tells us, "*Quo præcisè anno sit defunctus (Herodes),*" fixes on the year 754 for the death of Herod, and dates the birth of Christ *four* years earlier. But why do not the Editors tell us what is true, namely, that Dr. Lardner, in the very place where the date of 751 is assigned for the death of Herod, gives two computations of the birth of our Saviour, each of them falling short of the above date. The one September or October A. U. C. 748; the other September or October 749\*. Instead of which, and in defiance of their own chosen authority, they again most peremptorily assure the reader that Herod **MUST HAVE BEEN** dead two years before Christ was born! Another reference is here made to *Grotius*, on Luke iii. 23, who, for all that we can find, says not a word about it. He endeavours certain-

\* This latter date the learned Doddridge prefers, who inclines to adopt Dr. Lardner's calculation, rather than Mr. Manne's, whose elaborate and elegant Dissertation on the Birth of Christ would alone serve to overset the confident assertion of the Editors. Mr. Manne thinks Christ was born in the spring of 747, and that Herod died about the Passover, A. U. C. 750, towards the end of March.

ly to settle the date of our Saviour's entrance on his Ministry, but without the smallest allusion to the death of Herod.

We are next cautioned against trusting to the authenticity of these chapters, on the high authority of *Marcion*, who, we are told, though a reputed heretic, was a man of learning and integrity for any thing that appears to the contrary. I shall not stop to dispute either his learning or integrity, because the learned may be mistaken, and the honest may be prejudiced\*. I only know, that, like the Ebionites, he was a most notorious *taker-away*: as the Ebionites, by the confession of the Editors, "*took away*," even the genealogy, (they had previous taken away from the Old Testament, as some allege, all but the books of the Pentateuch, nor did they admit the whole of them) *Marcion* is said to have *taken-away* all the Old Testament, three of the four Gospels, several Epistles, and altered, abridged, or interpolated whatever he choose to retain. The Editors say he did this "like some moderns." It is fit then surely, that we should keep a strict eye upon such *takers away*, for fear their learning and integrity should be of the same predatory nature as *Marcion's*, and tempt them to commit trespasses as little to be justified.

But St. Luke does not mention in his Preface to the Acts of the Apostles, that his Gospel contained any thing more than records of the public Ministry of Christ: he does not allude to the incidents contained in the two first chapters, "which

† One Unitarian writer does not seem to hold him in much estimation, "absurd, as that man shewed himself to be," says Mr. Jones in his Illustrations of the Gospels

therefore probably were not written by him." As this objection is allowed to reach no higher than to a bare probability, I shall not spend any time upon it, except to observe, that neither are the incidents contained in the *third* chapter, included in the *short Summary, Acts* i. 1, which extends only to what "Jesus began both to do and to teach." The third chapter however, the Editors account genuine.

They next tell their readers as before, that "If the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus be true, he could not be the offspring of David and of Abraham, from whom it was predicted, and by the Jews expected that the Messiah should descend." *Now this is a downright falsehood!* which I may say without rudeness, nay rather with some civility; because the *Editors themselves* had previously *contradicted it* in their note on St. Matthew, where we read, that the account of the miraculous conception does "*not at all militate against the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ.*"

They go on to repeat, that "there is no allusion to any of these extraordinary facts in either of the succeeding histories of Luke, or in any other books of the New Testament. Jesus is *uniformly* spoken as the Son of Joseph and Mary, and as a *native* of Nazareth, and no expectation whatever appears to have been excited in the *public* mind by these *wonderful* and *notorious* events." Having replied to these objections before, I shall not dwell upon them here, except to notice a few *incorrect* expressions.

Jesus is *not* uniformly spoken of as the Son of Joseph and Mary; he is *continually* spoken of, as "the Son of God;" "the Son of the most High;" "the Son of the living God;" the Son of the Blessed;" the "only-begotten of God." He is *not* uniformly spoken of as a *native* of Nazareth; the Evange-  
lists

lists do not themselves declare him to be so in any one instance; St Luke in particular lays a stress upon his being *brought up* at Nazareth. See Chap. iv. 16. Imp. Version. His *Opponents* accuse him of being such, as a reason for *rejecting* him, alleging particularly, that if he was the Christ, he *must have been* born at Bethlehem; that he was educated and dwelt at Nazareth is granted, but though by residence and connections a Galilean, God's especial interposition appears to have been directed, to make him by *birth* a Bethlehemite, of the city of David.

Lastly, though the events attending his birth were wonderful enough to excite the awe and attention of all who witnessed them, yet they were *not* public and *notorious*. Herod himself, nay, all Jerusalem, including the Chief Priests and scribes of the people, were not let into the secret. Those who could very well tell, where the Messiah *ought to be born*, did not know where he *was* born; a circumstance however duly discovered to others for the highest purposes, namely, that *some* witnesses at least might be forthcoming to establish, when *necessary*, that criterion of his Messiahship, his birth at Bethlehem in Judea.

The date of the enrolment, Chap. ii. 1. is mentioned as a great historical difficulty, without however the usual reference to Lardner, who, though he certainly treats it as a difficulty, so unravels the mystery as to leave it no longer such. "That St. John the Baptist should be ignorant of the person of Christ is not probable if this narrative be true." Though it has been pretty generally supposed that John knew not the person of Jesus before his baptism, we are not quite certain that this was actually the case. In two instances John does  
certainly



certainly declare, that he “knew him not,” and these cases are cited by the Editors. John i. 31—

34. But we should much question if more was implied by these terms than that he knew him not as the Messiah\*, till it was especially revealed to him on his approach to be baptized.

Grotius is disposed to adopt this interpretation, but those who do not adopt it, very rationally attribute his ignorance, to the providential interposition of God, to take off all suspicion of conspiracy. See Beza and Doddridge. At all events no argument can be drawn from a circumstance which *for* any thing we know, might be accidental, and *from* what we know, would appear to be providential.

The last remark of the Editors relates to the probability of interpolation; in answer to those who think so large and gross an interpolation would never have escaped detection, or been so early and so generally received, we are reminded that it was not admitted into the Hebrew copies of Matthew's Gospel, nor into Marcion's copies of St. Luke. That is, in fact they were not to be found in the Canon of Scripture which the Ebionites and Marcion chose to adopt, nor very much more than is allowed to be genuine Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament. Most of the historical, prophetical, and hagiographical books of the former, and in the case of Marcion particularly, not three of the Gospels, not many of the Epistles, not the Apocalypse. Thus discarded, it must be allowed they have honourable company to keep in countenance in their banishment.

\* When this part of the Remarks was first published I had forgotten that *Dr. Priestley*, was of the *same* opinion. See the third Volume of his Notes on the Bible, p. 36. where the point is well argued.

But

But, it is added, "it is notorious that forged writings, under the names of the Apostles were in circulation almost from the apostolic age." It is surely equally notorious, that when the Canon was compiled, these forgeries were quite as well known to the compilers as to the Unitarians of the present day, and that so much has been set aside of these forgeries, and rejected among the *ψευδεπιγραφα* is in itself sufficient proof that all that has been retained underwent due examination. "If the orthodox charge the heretics, the heretics, we are told, equally charge the orthodox with corrupting the text." How could it be otherwise\*? And yet the orthodox may be quite right after all. The Unitarians declare that the Ebionites, improperly *took away* the genuine genealogy of Matthew. Would not the Ebionites, if they could speak for themselves, retort, that the Unitarians very improperly receive it as genuine Scripture, and yet are not the Unitarians quite right in giving it a place in their Canon? I ought indeed to say the Editors of this Version, rather than the Unitarians in general, for there are some of the latter, who, like the Ebionites of old, are for *taking away* "even the genealogy," but with these I have little to do at present.

\* I confess I was at the first much surprized at so strange a remark; but have been the more so since upon reading the following citation from Tertullian in a letter in the Monthly Repository signed B (probably Mr. Belsham the principal Editor of the Improved Version.) Ego meum dico verum, (says the *honest* Tertullian,) Marcion suum. Ego Marcionis adfirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum. Quis inter nos determinabit? Adv. Marcion: l. 4. c. 3. It is plain that such recriminations *prove nothing*, the "Quis determinabit," is the main question still.

It

It was easier, say the Editors, to introduce interpolations when copies were few and scarce, than since they have been multiplied to so great a degree by means of the press. This we must have leave to deny. The press might now indeed give ample currency to any adopted interpolation, but every manuscript must have constituted an individual and distinct copy in those days, and an interpolation in one could scarcely find its way so correctly into every other, and be transferred into every version, so dispersed as they were, and so variously circumstanced, and yet, as it happens, these narratives (as the Editors tell us,) are to be found in *every known manuscript and every known version.*

Lastly, we are taught to notice that the interpolation in question, would to the generality of Christians be extremely gratifying, as it would lessen the odium attached to Christianity from its founder being a crucified Jew, and would **ELEVATE** him to the **DIGNITY** of the **HEROES** and **DEMI-GODS** of the **HEATHEN MYTHOLOGY!!**

Gracious Heaven! elevate the Saviour of the world to the dignity of the heroes and demi-gods of the heathen mythology!!

Was it necessary for those who had the apocalypse in their hands (a part of Scripture which the Editors willingly account genuine) to describe the *birth* of Jesus, as it is described in Matthew and Luke, to give him a poor virgin for his mother, a small village for his birth-place, a stable for his nursery, and a manger for his cradle, in order to raise him to the rank of a *heathen demi-god*? **HE** who declares himself in another part of Scripture, to be "the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, unto whom every creature that is in

Heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, and all things in them, ascribe blessing, and glory, and dominion for ever and ever!" Was it necessary to make *him* to be a carpenter's son in order to elevate him to the rank of a demi-god, "who has the keys of death and the grave!" What mythological idol could ever be compared to the Lamb of the Apocalypse, the LORD OF LORDS, and KING OF KINGS? What demi-god of Paganism ever made such an appearance as the WORD of GOD in the Revelations? I shall take the Editors own Version.

"And I saw Heaven opened, and behold a white horse, and he who sat upon him was called faithful and true, and with righteousness he judgeth and maketh war. And his eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns. And he had a name written which none knoweth but himself: and he was clothed with a mantle dipt in blood: and his name is called THE WORD OF GOD: and the armies which were in Heaven followed him on white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and pure: and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword, that with it he might smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron and he shall tread the wine press of the fierce anger of Almighty God: and he had on his mantle and on his thigh, a name written, KING of KINGS and LORD of LORDS!"

What can be said to those who talk of *elevating* such a personage to the rank of a heathen demi-god!

Thus far, our attention has been directed particularly to the suspicions entertained of the genuineness and authenticity of those parts of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, which



give an account of the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus Christ. Closely connected with this are the doctrines commonly entertained of the pre-existence and divinity of our Saviour, which doctrines it is the professed object of the present Version to do away, by an abandonment of what the Editors call those "technical phrases of a systematic theology, which has no foundation in the Scriptures themselves." I cannot quite understand what they mean in this place by the "technical phrases of a systematic theology." Technical phrases must surely imply appropriate phrases, whether they relate to the arts or sciences; and as to a systematic theology, any theology without a system, must surely be no better than "the baseless fabric of a vision."

Assuredly this Unitarian theology is systematic, and nothing can more strongly prove it than the Version now edited. Not a word or phrase, or various reading, that at all breaks in upon that *system*, is suffered to escape without some hint of a corruption of the text, some alteration, or some comment to explain away its most obvious and literal meaning: and as to technical phrases, they may be just as technical in the way of negation as in the way of assertion. "If the Improved Version," says an Unitarian in the Monthly Repository, "be regarded as a party production it must be principally from the complexion of the doctrinal notes." It may be just as technical to call the only-begotten of God a mere attribute, as to call him a person; and it is evidently much more *technical* to evade the most approved interpretations, than to abide by the obvious and plain language of Holy Writ. In regard to those two great doctrines of our Saviour's pre-existence and divinity, we find no-  
thing

thing but evasion: evasion the most *systematic*, and a choice of terms the most invariably *technical*, as appropriate exclusively to their own system of belief. Thus it is that Κύριε, as addressed to our Lord, is too commonly rendered Sir, or Master, or Teacher, and the term προσκυνεῖν, under the same circumstances, never allowed to stand for more than the mere act of obeisance. The Logos or Word of God, is, (we had almost said) accounted no more than a mere nick-name of the *Prophet* Jesus; and the "Creation of *all things*," is represented to be the Creation of *nothing*. Not that we are at all disposed to deny that Κύριε may with much propriety in some places of Scripture be rendered Sir, or Master; that προσκυνεῖν has the meaning of obeisance; that Jesus may be termed "the Logos because God revealed himself or his word by him," (as we are reminded that Archbishop Newcome explains it), or that there is no *new Creation* ever spoken of, that is spiritual and strictly evangelical. But invariably to regard the expressions alluded to, as comprehending under them nothing more, no higher doctrines, that is, than are conveyed by the renderings and commentaries of the Editors, is to suppress many real matters of fact, which tend to fix the true and undoubted meaning of the sacred writers. So far from enabling the judicious and attentive reader (as the Editors profess) to understand Scripture phraseology, it is really to take from them, the very best means of doing so. Nothing can be more true, than the remark of that eloquent writer Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "That though every man may soon span his own knowledge, our ignorance we can never fathom." In publications of the nature of the one before us, the world in general would be

utterly astonished to know, what a mass of ancient learning, including much matter of positive fact, is wholly kept out of sight, though of the utmost importance to the full understanding of the doctrines of Scripture. How should it be possible for any unlearned Christian to understand, where such information is studiously suppressed, that the very name of *God* is often given to Christ, where the received translation only renders it *Lord*, and this *improved* Version *Sir* or *Master*: and yet this seems to me as capable of demonstration, as any proposition in Euclid\*.

For instance, that the name *Jehovah* was by the Jews invariably understood to be so exclusively appropriated to God, as to be perfectly incommunicable to any creature, is a truth entirely indisputable: and any application of this title to a creature would always have been esteemed the most rank idolatry, the basest dereliction of the first great principle of their faith. Nevertheless all the Evangelists begin their Gospels with the account of the preaching of St. John the Baptist, declaring that "this was he that was spoken of by the

\* Mr. Lindsey has a curious way of getting over this difficulty. The Apostles, he tells us, were not so exact in the use of the words *Lord* and *Saviour* which they gave *indifferently* both to *God* and *Christ*, never supposing that any would mistake their Lord and Master so lately born and living among men, to be the Supreme God and object of worship," Apology, p. 147. But how shall we account for its being spoken of as the *peculiar* glory both of God and Christ, to be the universal Saviour of mankind. The *only* Saviour of the world. How shall we account for St. Paul's expressly applying to Christ, Phil. ii. 10. what Isaiah applies in the most peculiar manner to God, xlv. 23. as the just God and Saviour of man, than whom there is none else, none beside Him of whom he was speaking. See President Edwards's Works.

prophet Isaiahs, saying, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the LORD, make his paths straight." Now in the original prophecy of Isaiah the words are these, "Prepare ye the way of JEHOVAH; and as every body knows that the LXXII Jews, who made the Greek translation of the Bible, had no other term to express JEHOVAH but the term *Κύριος*, it should certainly be so rendered in the above passages of the Gospels; for "here," as a very learned author says, "we find *all* the *four* Evangelists, three of whom at least were Jews, bearing witness to the same thing, that Jesus is the JEHOVAH prophesied of by Isaiah, whose way the Baptist was to prepare \*."

If any should be disposed to doubt whether *Κύριος* is equivalent to JEHOVAH, the Editors of this work supply us with three instances of it in their rendering of Matth. xxii. 44. Mark xii. 36. Luke xx. 42. Here they themselves with great propriety render *ὁ Κύριος*, Jehovah. And a Jewish Targum helps us to another remarkable fact upon this very passage. "The Lord said unto my Lord," is in the T. of Jonathan, "Jehovah said unto his WORD †". This opens to us a new subject; for here is the WORD of JEHOVAH, the ΛΟΓΟΣ or WORD of God, fully acknowledged by a Jew, in a passage particularly appropriated to himself by our blessed Saviour, and evidently implying a personal distinction.

\* In the Syriac the reading is, prepare ye the way for our God, Luke iii. 4. See Ludov. de Dieu, and Griesbach's various readings.

See on *ὁ Κύριος* as expressive of Jehovah. Pearson, 150, and Sharp's Law of Nature, p. 276.

† See more upon this paraphrase below.



Now these are all *positive facts*, which apply to every part of the Christian Scriptures, and the bare mention of which is sufficient to show us, that a new version, in which such matters are *totally suppressed* or *disregarded*, cannot be a fair interpretation of the real sentiments of *Jewish* writers. None can be ignorant how much is said about the WORD of GOD in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel.

Now all that the world in general will learn from this Version, of this remarkable term is, that it either means the *wisdom* of God, (according to our contemporary Mr. Lindsey,) or that it is a name given to our Saviour, because by *Him*, as *one* of his *Messengers* or *Prophets*, God revealed himself or his *Word* in the Gospel—given to him “in the beginning,” *that is*, from the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, and *not before*. This is what the Editors tell us, but undoubtedly the main question is, what must St. John have thought or known of the term? The Editors certainly cite a passage from one of his Epistles, in order to make the Evangelist explain *himself*, but as it often happens, what appears to *them* to confirm *their* apprehension of matters, appears to *us* most strongly to confirm *our* sense of things. This must unavoidably happen; any expression, by a positive denial of the fact to which it is thought to allude, must of course appear to infer something else. So it is, that what is predicated of our Saviour, Gal. iv. 4. that he “was made of a woman,” is perfectly understood by those who believe in his incarnation, to have an allusion to that peculiar doctrine; but take away the doctrine, and it must needs seem to allude to some different event. But the question must still remain; Was there any actual incarnation of a superior being to which it *might* bear allusion? and so stand the questions

questions that relate to the sense of Κύριος, αἰὶά Λόγος, in the evangelical and apostolic writings. They *may seem* to many to allude to nothing higher than what the Version and Commentaries of these Editors imply, but it must remain a question, whether there *is* any thing more, any higher doctrines, to which they *may* allude.

If Κύριος is the only Greek term used by Jewish writers for Jehovah, a question must naturally arise, whether it appears to have been ever so used by the Jewish writers of the New Testament, as necessarily to have conveyed to *their* minds the sense of Jehovah. If the Λόγος, or Word of God, was a title at all known to the Jews before the commencement of the Gospel dispensation \*, and before Christ was born

\* If ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος means in the beginning in its fullest extent, that is, as the Jews interpret the prophecy of Micah, “Egressiones ejus sunt ab Initio. Quum mundus nondum esset conditus.” Prov. viii 22. (See the Pirke of R. Eleazer, and the Greek of this in the Septuagint.) What could better express the same than the terms used in the first chap. of St. John’s first Epistle: Ὁ ἦν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς (καὶ ἐξόδοι αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς is the LXX rendering of Micah.) Ὁ ἠρώταμεν, — Καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν περὶ τοῦ Λόγου τῆς ζωῆς — Καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη — ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν — Is not this perfectly analogous to the terms of the Gospel? Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῷ Κόσμῳ ἦν. Καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν — Καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. — We must confess the expressions convey to us (as they do to the Editors) exactly the same sense, though we differ as to the object of both passages. They think all these terms merely allude to the ministry of a prophet, who had a word to deliver, and eternal life to preach, and spiritual light to bestow upon his followers and disciples. We think they allude to a pre-existent being who had all these things in himself, as subsisting in unity with the Father, before all ages, and before all worlds, and who became manifest in the flesh solely for our redemption. That such great stress should be laid upon the mere  
manifestation

born into the world, a question must naturally arise, whether a Jewish writer, calling him the Λό-  
 γος, or WORD, could only intend it as an apt  
 description of that prophet who was ordained to re-  
 veal to man the Gospel covenant. Ancient learn-  
 ing may come to be depised by all those who think  
 modern philosophy far superior to it, but *facts* can-  
 not be got rid of. We cannot with all our philoso-  
 phy do more than object to the terms; we cannot  
 possibly insist upon it, that a Jewish writer, had  
 not Jewish notions of the terms he used: nor can  
 we with any decency pretend, that God would  
 countenance the delivery of heavenly truths, in terms  
 that must have conveyed one meaning at one time,  
 and another at another. If it can be proved by fair  
 argument, that the sense put upon certain expres-  
 sions by the Unitarians could not possibly be the  
 sense intended by Jewish writers of the first cen-  
 turies, we cannot believe that sense to be the true  
 one. The most ordinary understanding, I would  
 hope, might be brought to apprehend what I mean;  
 though while I wish to be quite as generally intel-  
 ligible as the Editors of this new Version, I must  
 have leave to premise, that it is somewhat a harder  
 task to bring forward ancient facts and ancient  
 records, in support of the venerable writings in

manifestation, or rather mission of a prophet, or that such sin-  
 gular terms should be requisite to prove against the Gnostics  
 or Docetes that he was actually a man, and no more than a mere  
 man, we confess we see no reason; on the contrary, we see  
 great reason why the Apostle should expressly have avoided  
 such terms, had this been the utmost of his pretensions. I  
 know Pearson, and Whitby, and other great critics, do not in-  
 terpret *απ' αρχης* in this way, but I have many eminent com-  
 mentators on my side, and I confess, I mean to lay the greatest  
 stress on the *manifestation in the flesh* of the WORD of Life  
 &c.

question,

question, than to modernize them for common reading by a suppression of all the testimony to be drawn from the records of antiquity.

And here I find myself under the disagreeable necessity of adverting to a circumstance, which has occurred since the first publication of this part of my Remarks. In the Brit. Crit. vol. xxxiv. p. 165, I had referred to Jeremiah xxiii. 6, to prove that the Messiah had been expressly foretold under the name of "JEHOVAH our Righteousness," for which rash act I have received the following severe castigation, in Dr. Carpenter's Letters to Mr. Veyesie, lately published. Dr. Carpenter is an opponent, who generally writes with good temper, and courtesy, and I have often gone out of my way to commend him for it, and to speak of him with respect, and had even done so, in the following remarks, before this reproof met my eye, which expressions I shall now most willingly leave untouched, only observing, that on these accounts, the severity of his expressions, on this particular occasion, must naturally be the more ungrateful to my feelings. Dr. C. refers to Dr. Blayney's correction of the passage, Jeremiah xxiii. 6. "Blaney," he says, thus translates the passage, "and this is the Name by which *Jehovah* shall call *him*, Our Righteousness;" and this learned Critic, he adds, has the following remark in his note: "I doubt not but some persons will be offended with me, for depriving them, by this translation, of a favourite argument, for proving the divinity of our Saviour from the Old Testament. But I cannot help it: *I have done it with no ill design, but purely because I think, and am morally sure, that the text, as it stands, will not properly admit of any other construction.* The LXX have so translated it before me



me in an age, when there could not possibly be any bias of prejudice, either for or against the fore-mentioned doctrine; *a doctrine which draws its decisive proofs from the New Testament only.* In the parallel passage, Ch. xxxiii. 16, the expression is a little varied, but the sense, according to a just and literal translation, is precisely the same; “and this is *he* whom *Jehovah* shall call *our Righteousness.*”

To this citation from Dr. Blayney, Dr. Carpenter subjoins the following note: “Is it possible that Mr. Nares could be ignorant of the *true* rendering of this passage? See *Brit. Crit.* Aug. 1809, p. 165, and *probably* his remarks on the improved Version, there and elsewhere announced. That gentleman obviously is as unacquainted with the amount of the phraseology of the *Targumim*, and its weight in the argument, as he appears to be with general candour; I am not surprised to find him also dwelling on Mr. *Sharp's* canon; I regard it as a corroborative proof of the weakness of his cause.”

Before I proceed to enter into the particulars of this severe note, I shall first observe, that I apprehend Dr. C. confounds me, (as has often been the case,) with a much more eminent and learned Critic, my namesake and relation, the Rev. *Arch-deacon* Nares; this gentleman, whom I am proud to call my particular friend, as well as my relation, ought not to be made answerable for my ignorance and stupidity; I therefore beg to take the full weight of the charge upon myself, observing only that my friend knows, better than Dr. Carpenter, what fair excuses I have to plead, for any accidental *ignorance* of the nature alluded to. He knows, that my constant residence is in a most retired country village, wholly out of the reach of any books whatsoever, but such as my own private  
library

library supplies : Dr. Blayney's edition of Jeremiah, *is not at my command* ; yet to say I knew not of his correction, and his remarks, would be wrong ; I knew he read the passage differently, but I could not cite his exact words ; I knew he had made particular remarks upon it, but they were not immediately in my recollection. They are certainly strong, and I am confident, *sincere* and *honest* ; for I had the happiness of being personally well known to that learned Professor, and I venerated him highly. Some of my early writings, upon the particular subject of the Trinity, underwent his immediate inspection, and, as is well known to others besides myself, were honoured with his approbation ; upon no grounds whatsoever, therefore, would I be supposed, wantonly, to slight his opinions.

But, (not to obtrude *my own opinion* upon the case) it happens to be also in my recollection, that Dr. B.'s amendment of the passage in Jeremiah, soon after its appearance, was disputed by another most eminent biblical Critic, Dr. Eveleigh, now Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, and the impression made upon my mind at the very time by the learned Provost's remarks, was, that the *true* reading had *not* been so decisively settled by Dr. Blayney, as Dr. C. asserts. I had also read with attention a more recent critique upon the subject, in which Dr. Blayney's version is declared to be so unwarrantable, as to be quite unbecoming a Hebrew professor, and though out of respect, and regard for his memory, I forbear to repeat all that is *there* expressed upon the subject, yet I must declare, that undoubtedly the case appears to me, to be entirely proved against him, and this as I conceive, by a *very eminent Hebrew scholar*, of a neighbouring Kingdom. See the  
*Sacred*

*Sacred Criticism*, by *Inspector*, in the 2d Vol. of the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine, p. 383; see also Mr. Sharp's learned notes on the passage, in his *Law of Nature*. Even the Septuagint appears, from this writer's remarks, (and even from *St. Jerome's*, in my opinion, as cited by Bishop *Pearson*, fol. 147) to be decidedly against Dr. Blayney. The term ΙΟΥΔΑΙΣΜΟΣ being sufficient to express all that is required : see also the various readings of the passage in Bos's Edition of the LXX.

Dr. Carpenter might at least have allowed me the credit of being supported by the Jewish Rabbins, cited by Bishop *Pearson*, and other most eminent writers, particularly by the learned Author above, from *De Rossi*, and whose testimony is so particular, as in my opinion to be sufficient alone to prove the point.

Since, however, the passage is still thought by *Dr. C.'s party*, so questionable, as not to be produced against them with *candour*, I have willingly withdrawn it, though after all, I really adopted the reference from a writer, whom Dr. C. himself is often glad to cite on the subject of *atonement*; I mean the celebrated Henry Taylor, who contends, with such force of argument, as I confess, appears to me to be irresistible, that if the original term JEHOVAH had been preserved, as it should have been, in such passages of the New Testament, instead of *Κυριος*, the proof that JESUS is called JEHOVAH would be indisputable."

"My Ignorance of the amount of the phraseology of the *Targumim*, and its weight in the argument," which Dr. C. places upon a footing with my *want of candour*, may be consummate, but certainly is not *very candidly* concluded upon, from the remarks in  
the

the Brit. Crit., to which alone Dr. C. alludes; for though I acknowledge, that I have there, (and now again,) referred to the *Targum of Jonathan*, concerning which many doubts prevail, yet I was careful to intimate, from the first, by a marginal note, that I had *more to say upon the subject*; which additional remarks, though then written, have only now for the first time passed through the hands of the printer.

As to my dwelling upon Mr. Sharp's canon, I have studiously abstained from any dwelling upon it, beyond what the improved Version authorises. How could I pass over passages, the *rendering* of which has been judged by both parties of late, of such singular importance, without noticing such points as have been supposed unfairly to give a wrong turn to the sense. If the *weakness* of my *cause* is *proved* at once, by my dwelling at all upon this canon, I am content to abide by the consequences; for until *that weakness* becomes as strikingly apparent to myself, as to Dr. C., he may pity my infatuation, but he must approve my determination, to adhere to the faith of my forefathers.

From a note Dr. C. introduces, also from Dr. Geddes, in regard to the Elohim, it is very evident, that much of the following remarks will appear to him exceedingly frivolous, obsolete, and unwarrantable. I might add (to repeat the mockery he adopts, contrary to his usual good manners) *etymologico-mystico-cabalistical*; I cannot help it. Before I saw his work, my views and intentions were written and recorded. I do not upon *my own authority* pretend to *decide* any thing, I only wish to apprise the public, that works are still in existence which in *my* opinion ought to be consulted  
before



before they give full credit to the peremptory assertions of the Editors of the *Improved Version*. I ought rather perhaps to say, the peremptory *negations* of the Editors, for though they have sometimes recourse to criticism, argument and explanation, yet *too often* their notes consist solely of plain and unqualified declarations, that such, and such passages of Scripture do not express the doctrines hitherto supposed to be conveyed by them. I have been anxious also to remind my fellow Christians of an important truth that seems in some danger of being forgotten, namely, that the NEW Testament, however improved and corrected, is but HALF the BIBLE, a portion only of the revealed word of God. I am not over-desirous, any more than Dr. *Bloynney*, of going to the Old Testament for the doctrine of the Trinity, and in terms as strong as those he uses, have I heretofore declared, that I rest my own faith, primarily and principally, if not solely, on the evidence of the New Testament. (See the concluding note to my VIIth *Bampton Lecture*, 1805,) but I am confident there is much curious matter of fact to be learnt from a reference to ancient writers, and Jewish interpretations of Scripture, and notwithstanding all the endeavours made to point out contradictions and impossibilities in our representation of matters, I am fully persuaded that much of it is far above the reach of the scorn and mockery of modern sciolists. I must add, that Dr. *Geddes's* remarks on the *Elohim*, were long ago replied to; see the *Brit. Crit.* Vol. xix. 136. This answer, I have reason to believe, was from the pen of one of Dr. G.'s most celebrated contemporaries, a Hebrew scholar of the highest eminence, now deceased. (I have other sufficient answers lying before me.) As Dr. C. ap-  
pears

pears to be a reader of the Brit. Crit., I might perhaps be allowed to say, "is it possible Dr. C. could be ignorant of *that* reply."—But I forbear: I by no means suspect Dr. C. of any deliberate unfairness. It does not appear to me to be his general character; nor would I wish to do him so serious a personal injury, as wantonly to fix an *indeible stigma* on his *name*, in a work more likely to be read by his opponents than his friends.

I shall conclude this long and unpleasant digression, (too long to be thrown into a note) with a citation from Dr. *Blayney*, in reply to Dr. *Eveleigh*. It is to be found in the Appendix to his Version of *Zechariah*.

"Yet is *the* doctrine (of the Trinity) not the less true, or the less certain, on that account. It is a doctrine, that must ultimately depend on the revelation of the New Testament, and by Gospel proofs must stand or fall. AND I AM WELL ASSURED THAT IT WILL STAND, BUILT FIRM UPON THE FOUNDATION OF A ROCK, WHICH THE ASSAULTS OF INFIDELITY SHALL NEVER BE ABLE TO SHAKE!"

To return now to the principal subject of my Remarks.—In our examination of this Version, we meet with many passages in which particular care seems to be taken, to speak of our Saviour as A Son of God, because the article before *υἱος* happens to be omitted. Now this looks like stratagem. It must be intended to imply something; that our Saviour for instance, is to be considered as only figuratively, and not actually, *a* or *the* Son of God; like those, in short, to whom the Word of God came, [Psalm lxxxii. 6.] or the faithful and elect children of the Gospel, [John i. 12.] But not to insist here upon the particular circumstances of distinction, surely if he is even *once* declared upon proper authority to  
be

be ὁ υἱὸς τῷ Θεῷ, (and he certainly is so, upon the greatest, as the Improved Version sufficiently expresses, Luke xxii. 70, 71. and note †) or ὁ υἱὸς τῷ Εὐλογητῷ, Mark xiv. 62. The omission of the article in other places does by no means tend to do away the peculiarity of his filiation \*, and yet though in the two passages just referred to, the Editors plainly acknowledge, that our Lord fully confessed himself to be "THE SON of GOD," and "THE SON of the BLESSED God;" yet in John xix. 7. they reject Archbishop Newcome's insertion of the definite article, and make the charge of the Jews to be no more, than that he made himself A Son of GOD, which, in any other sense than the one we contend for, could not have amounted to blasphemy.

They once indeed venture to call him, (as υἱὸς Θεῷ, without the article,) *A Son of a God*; and in the correspondent passage in Mark xv. 39. the Son of A God; that is, of Jupiter or Mercury, or Sommonocodom, the God of Siam perhaps †; however, to be fair with them, it is certainly only put

\* That the mere omission of the article is not of the importance the Editors seem disposed to infer may appear from the following passage of Ignatius. Ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ κατὰ σὰρκα ἱκνένοντι Δαβὶδ τῷ υἱῷ Ἀνθρώπου καὶ υἱῷ Θεοῦ. How strange and how contrary to the writer's intention would it be to render it, "In Jesus Christ, *the* Son of a Man and *a* Son of a God."

† Matthew xiv. 33. Our Lord's Disciples are described as worshipping, (or doing obeisance to him, as the Editors have it), saying, Ἀληθῶς Θεὸς υἱὸς εἶ, could *they* mean truly Thou art A Son of A God? The Editors have it A Son of God, rejecting Newcome's rendering THE Son of God. When our Saviour was crucified, his enemies reviled him, alleging that he had said, οὐ Θεὸς εἰμι υἱὸς, Matth. xxvii. 43. but what he *had* said, was, that he was ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, see Ch. xxvi. 63, 64. The Editors render the former passage, THE Son of God. On the value and importance of the article, Bishop Pearson should undoubtedly be consulted, fol. Edit. p. 120. See also on the term Emmanuel, as explained by Matthew, ib. p. 130.

into

into the mouth of the Roman Centurion, and though I conceive that this officer was not unacquainted with the charge of blasphemy under which he suffered, yet I shall not further notice it at present, except to observe, that as Grotius remarks, it is at least a proof that he thought him as much a God as Hercules, Æsculapius, &c. The Editors, however, should at least be consistent, but they are not so \*; they omit or insert both the definite and indefinite article as they choose, and this both in regard to the title of Son of God and Son of Man, both of which we think designate the Messiah. Thus in regard to the latter they insert the definite article before *uios* in that particular passage, John v. 27 †, which Chrysostom thought of so much moment as to propose a new reading. For, says he, if according to this passage, authority to execute Judgment was given to him merely as man, that is, as A Son of MAN, (for the articles are omitted,) a like authority might be given to any man or all men; he proposes therefore to make the pause after “judgment,” and then to proceed, Because he is *A Son of MAN* wonder not: that is, wonder not that such a power should be given to a Son of Man, because he is in fact much more, for “the

\* In one page they expressly render it THE Sòn of God, where the article is omitted in the original, and A Son of God where it occurs, Luke iv. 3. and 9. Grotius and Beza indeed incline to think it should be read without the article in the last passage, but principally because it is omitted in the former.

† And yet in their notes, give the true reading as adopted even by Mr. Wakefield. How much has been thought to depend on the omission of the article here, may be seen in Bishop Bull's *Prim. et Apost. Trad.* Ch. vi. §§ 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23. The insertion of the definite and rejection of the indefinite article is curious enough.



hour cometh, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear *his* voice, &c.”—Now if this reasoning is right, and it has certainly been approved by very eminent scholars \*, and even the Syriac Version favours it, we are bound to conclude, that *the* Son of Man is as emphatical as *the* Son of God, and both of them particularly appropriate to the Messiah, who is both the Son of God, *καὶ ὁ υἱος* in a most peculiar and singular manner, and the Son of Man in the same way, *Καὶ ὁ υἱος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, and singularly foretold as such by the prophet Daniel †. These things therefore require to be attended to. If the omission of the article is of importance, the insertion of it is of importance also. If the omission of it directs us to interpret the passage generally, the insertion of it must direct us to interpret it *εἰσαριθμῶς*. If our Saviour is but once pronounced to be *the* Son of God, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, then

\* See Erasmus in loco. Beza objects to Chrysostom’s emendation, but thinks the expression general, and therefore gives no warrant for the insertion of the definite article.

† This is of importance, and should be remembered, because Unitarians are not backward to admit, that the title as assumed by our Lord is emphatic, but they suppose it directed against the Gnostics. “Our Lord,” says Mr. Jones, in his *Illustrations of the Gospels*, “styles himself, *The Son of Man*, the words certainly imply that Jesus possessed the nature and constitution of man. Appearing as man in the midst of men, and exposed to their wants and feelings, he yet inculcated *what none needed to learn*, (this is surely an oversight,) that he was a human being, and circumstanced as he was, there appears in this precaution the greatest propriety: For the Gnostic teachers denied his *humanity*; they rejected and blasphemed the Son of Man, the man Jesus, while they affected to honor and embrace the God within him continually.” But the title was very long before appropriated to the Messiah by Daniel, vii. 13, 14. where see the *glory* attributed to *that* Son of Man.

he

he certainly is so emphatically, and in the same manner as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου*, he must be man in a peculiar sense. There appears therefore to be nothing gained by this scrupulous attention to the articles on the part of the Editors. If Christ is *the* Son of God and *the* Son of Man, he must be *a* Son of God and *a* Son of Man; but the converse will not hold good—as a Son of God, and a Son of Man, he loses that distinction, which upon the testimony of Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles, is peculiarly and singularly appropriate to the Messiah. Throughout the whole of the New Testament he is spoken of as *the* Son of Man, and as *the* Son of God, so emphatically, as to leave no doubt, but that after some manner or other, to us unknown at present, he partook of both natures\*. I have thought it right to notice these things, because, without entering into an examination of every passage where the case applies, I feel warranted in declaring, that there appears to be an obvious intention on the part of the new commentators to

\* Since writing and indeed since publishing (in the Brit. Crit.) these remarks on the insertion or omission of the articles, I have been much gratified by finding that the impropriety has been noticed, and very candidly pointed out by some friends of the improved Version: in Aikin's Annual Register much occurs upon this subject, and it is explicitly acknowledged, that the omission of the article in the Greek, by no means authorises us to employ our indefinite article: and a very learned and dispassionate reviewer in the Monthly Repository, asserts, that the absence of the article does not necessarily make the noun indefinite, and indeed in a great variety of cases the Greek language does not require, and sometimes scarcely admits of the article where the noun is completely definite. This learned writer strongly objects to the rendering Matth. xvii. 54. A Son of A God, and generally to the strange expression of A day of Judgment for *ἡμέρα κρίσεως* in which we perfectly agree with him.

confound these matters ; by putting the indefinite article before *Son*, when applied to our Saviour without the article in the original, and not unfrequently inserting the definite article, where the terms “ Son of God,” are applied to subordinate beings, though the text does *not warrant* it, as Romans viii. 16. Gal. iii. 16. I do not deny that they have the countenance of the received Version for the insertion, in the *two passages just cited*, nor do I intend wholly to object to it, though it would be more correct to have omitted it in both Versions, but since the Editors do not scruple to mark it as an interpolation by printing it in Italics, and are so ready to take advantage of every omission of the article, when our Saviour is spoken of, I feel it to be fair to warn the public of the trap that *appears* to be laid for them. To show the distinction that should be preserved, I would refer for instance to Galatians iv. 4, 5, 6, 7, where the sonship of the elect is declared to be a mere matter of *adoption through Christ*, who is (with an emphasis not improperly expressed in the received text), declared to be *ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ*, God’s *own Son*\*, *sent forth from him*

\* It is curious to see how the unlearned may be misled by prejudiced translators. Nothing seems farther from the intention of the sacred writers than to describe our Saviour as an *adopted* Son of God; in this passage he seems directly and most emphatically to be distinguished from those who were to be *adopted* through him. Yet in the 1st of Hebrews, ver. 4, 5, where it is expressly said in the Greek that Christ *inherited* a more excellent name than the angels, and this is enforced by a reference to the Psalms, where it is said of the Messiah, “Thou art my *Son*, this day have I begotten thee.” The present Editors suppress the term *κληρονομήσας*, which marks the inheritance; and render *ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, this day I have *adopted* thee! Surely this is perfectly *systematic*, perfectly *technical*, in the style

him, to be born into the world, of a woman, under the law, that those that were under the law might obtain την Υιοθεσίαν, “adoption,” to be υιοι, Sons, δια Χριστου, through Christ. This may entitle them indeed to address God as Αἰεὶ, Father, but not to call him, as Christ does, πατέρα ἰδίου, his OWN PROPER Father. For this is undoubtedly the true sense of ἰδίου (and the Jews must have understood it so. See Doddridge, F. Ex. besides note (c.) p. 308. vol. i.) It serves well to explain the subsequent term ἰσόν in the same verse, the force of which is also lost in the present Version. See John v. 18.

And this seems to be a proper place to examine generally how far the present Editors have attended to Mr. Sharp’s rule concerning the insertion or omission of the definite article before personal, or, as Mr. Middleton terms it, attributive nouns. As they appear to be so observant of articles, we ought to find this rule properly exemplified here, if any where, or reasons stated for deviating from it; for the rule is now too publicly known, and too respectably supported, both by the consent of modern critics, and reference to more ancient ones, (See Brit. Crit. xx. 17.) to be wholly disregarded by any biblical critics, much more by any Editors of an improved Version of the New Testament. I shall

style of Unitarian theology. Some acknowledgment indeed we find in the notes, where we are told, that the *Greek original* and *Archbishop Newcome* are totally against them!—they had no objection to notice the heirship spoken of in ver. 2. οὐ θηκε κληρονομον πασιν; this they render as the received text has it, whom he hath appointed heir of all things. But as they determine the meaning of πασιν to reach no farther than to the things of the Christian dispensation, they admit the usual reading,—the inheritance of a name above angels, is a different matter,

care-



carefully examine some of the passages most liable to be affected by the neglect of this rule.

The first I shall select is that striking passage in the 2d ch. of Titus, Mr. Sharp's 7th example of his first rule, *Επιφανείαν τῆς δοξῆς τῆ μεγάλης Θεῆ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. It was impossible for me (I am sorry to say) to turn to this passage without some suspicions. I knew that there were two things which might tend greatly to interfere with the true sense of St. Paul—one, the insertion of the comma after Θεῆ, and the other, the repetition of the particle "of,"—two (*apparently*) very insignificant things, the importance of which indeed can be little understood but by professed critics, and yet of *such* importance as to demand the utmost attention of those who would protect the public from misrepresentations. Upon turning to this Version we find *both* admitted; the comma after Θεῆ, though not to be found in Griesbach, and the repetition of the particle "of," as though σωτῆρος was detached from the word preceding. Had not Mr. Sharp written a word about the definite article, this passage might surely have been produced as a stumbling-block to Unitarians. Beza's admirable note upon it, and the corroborating testimony of the Greek Fathers examined by Mr. Wordsworth, give it all the authority we could desire\*.

All translators, all commentators, all critics, must consent to be governed by the uncorrupted text of the original. In this there seems now to be no difficulty. The comma after Θεῆ has no authority to support it, even if some such mark is discernible in ancient MSS. it must be grammati-

\* See also the note in Brit. Crit. Vol. xx. p. 17.

cally wrong, as Mr. Sharp has shewn \*. We have two personal and descriptive nouns in the same case connected by the copulative, without any repetition of the article; and we have ἡμῶν common to both. What can be objected to the regular grammatical rendering of this sentence, “the glorious appearance of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ?” Nothing can reasonably be objected to this; but it *can be varied a little*; a comma after Θεῶν will separate it from σωτηρος, and the particle “of †,” repeated, will seem to begin a new sentence; but we cannot admit it ‡. In the Greek there is no comma, and according to the fair idiom of languages, there is no authority for the introduction of the particle “of” before Σωτήρος. According to Griesbach’s readings, even the copulative is omitted in some instances. The words Θεῶν and σωτήρος appear to be strictly predicated of Jesus Christ; and to disfigure this reading by a false insertion of a comma and a particle, is not to *improve* but to *corrupt* the text. After all, the question is better decided, perhaps, by a reference to the term ἐπιφάνεια, as Beza and Whitby suggest. *The appearance of the glory of the great*

\* Griesbach’s only various reading is the omission of Καί, which would make the case stronger.

† See Twells’ Critical Examination of the late new text and Version of the New Testament, published 1731. Part I. 138. Mr. Twells in every instance supports Mr. Sharp’s rule.

‡ The following passage, the construction of which is perfectly analogous, the Editors render according to the rule, 2 Peter ii. 20. See also 2 Pet. iii. 18. Phil. iv. 20. Gal. i. 4. Κατὰ το θελημα τε Θεου και πατρός ἡμῶν, rightly rendered “according to the will of our God and Father.” See also Ephes. v. 20. 1 Thess. i. 3. iii. 13. 2 Thess. ii. 16.

God,

God, must be the *Shechinah* \*; must be the visible *Jehovah*; must be the *Christ*, the *Messiah*.—The great God, *Jehovah* in his utmost, ineffable glory, never did, and never *will* appear in these lower regions; but the *visible Jehovah*, the *Shechinah*, the *Christ*, the *Messiah*, the *only begotten Son* of God, **HE** has appeared, and **WILL** appear! with all the power, all the authority, all the glory, all the greatness, of his inseparable Father, who is **EN—ONE** and **THE SAME**—(after some inexplicable manner,) but yet **EN—ONE**, we know not how, but there is an Unity, and there is a Trinity.

The next passage I shall notice is Ephesians v. 5.—*οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ*. The Editors adopt the received version, which Mr. *Sharp* long ago corrected, “in the kingdom of Christ and of God.”—It certainly would be more properly rendered “of the Christ and God.” If articles are of any importance, “of Christ and of God,” cannot be grammatically right.

*Κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. 2 Thess. i. 12. This is rendered “according to the favour of our God and of our Lord Jesus Christ.” The true and exact rendering must needs be, “according to the grace of **OUR GOD**

\* “*Επιφανεία*,” says *Twells*, “is an expression never applied to the Father (though *Grotius* affirms it without any proof,) but only to the glorious and last coming of the Son;” and the learned *Clemens Streson* on Coloss. i. 27, very properly observes, “*Notum præterea est Deum promississe Gloriam suam ulterius manifestare, et quod arca, Columna, Schechinah, ulterioris manifestationis fuere Symbola—hinc Esai. xl. 5. Gloria Dei manifestabitur. Hinc Israël, licet Deus suam Gloriam, illis notificaverat, tamen ulterius sperare debebat Gloriæ manifestationem: hæc autem Christum respexisse, non necesse puto ut demonstrem, quare quisque videt quomodo Apostolus potuit Christum dicere Spem Gloriæ, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης.*”

and

and LORD Jesus Christ.” “Of *our God* and *of our Lord Jesus Christ*,” is wholly inadmissible. There is not a pretension for any such rendering. Let the doctrine to be deduced from this passage be what it will, the rendering (with those who lay a stress upon articles) is strictly thus, “according to the grace of our *God* and *Lord Jesus Christ*.” The received Version really requires correction, but we look in vain to the present Editors for any such emendations.

1 Tim. v. 21. Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τῶ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This is rendered “I charge thee in the presence of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.” The received text is much the same; but it manifestly should be, “I charge thee before the God and Lord Jesus Christ.”

I could select other passages, well known to critics, illustrative of the propriety of these remarks, but as they would be from books, which the Editors have marked as *disputed*, I forbear to produce them; I shall therefore only refer to them, with this observation, that in the present Version they are rendered so as to be liable to the correction of Mr. *Sharp's* rule. They are as follow:  
2 Peter i. 1. Jude, 4.

I have thus far then endeavoured to shew, that the Jewish term *Jehovah*, the incommunicable name of the *One* great God, must often be intended in the writings of the New Testament by the term Κύριος, particularly where the *Jewish* writers of the *New Testament* refer to passages of the *Old*, in which the name of *Jehovah*, is unquestionably applied to the Messiah. If all the four Evangelists, for instance, in their accounts of the preaching of St. John, refer distinctly to the prophecy of Isaiah, ch. xl. 3. and cite it in the  
very



very words of the Jewish translators of the Old Testament, *Kypíz* must needs have the same force in all these places. In the Septuagint it is undeniably the rendering of JEHOVAH; in the original it is plainly predicated of the Messiah to come, that "Glory of the Lord (Jehovah) that shall be revealed," ver. 5. In the New Testament it is plainly applied to Christ, and what doubt therefore can remain but that *Jewish writers* have plainly spoken of him as JEHOVAH, ἡ Δόξα Κυρίου, the *Revealed Glory of God*, which in Jewish phraseology is but another name for the *Visible Jehovah*, the *Word of God*. If this is so, why should we hesitate to apply Mr. Sharp's rule to the Greek, and to conclude, that according to the plain idiom of that language the term Θεός is also applied to him in sundry passages, and consequently that we have the double testimony of Hebrew and Greek phraseology in favour of his divinity. This may be called the "technical phraseology of a systematic theology," but I cannot help it. I ought indeed, if I think it right, only to insist upon it the more strongly; for what would the public desire but to be put in possession of the real *system* of Revelation, expressed in terms the most strictly *suitable and appropriate*. It is the desire of doing this alone that could lead me into such discussions.

I have also endeavoured to show, though *I have not fully entered into this argument*, that divine *worship* may reasonably be held to have been considered as justly rendered to Christ by the Evangelists, though expressed in terms of some ambiguity. The Editors often dwell upon the circumstance of the Evangelists not contradicting the obvious sense of certain terms in their several Gospels,

pels, as a proof that such sense must be the proper one. If the Evangelists could be expected to do this, they must be supposed to have been extremely circumspect in the use of terms; and considering therefore that the claim to divine honours had involved our Saviour in the charge of blasphemy, and that προσκυνεῖν was a suspicious expression, (not to insist again upon the term Κυριος), it is scarcely to be supposed credible that they would have hazarded the use of such terms without some qualifying expression, had they not at least believed in their *own* minds, and intended therefore to intimate that divine worship was due to Christ. If St. John wrote the Apocalypse, and St. Luke the Acts of the Apostles, they must have known and felt the risk they must have run in the application of such terms to the "Son of God;" see Revelations xix. 10. and xxii. 8, 9. and Acts x. 25, 26. Whoever will be at the pains to examine the passages in which these terms are applied to our LORD by the *Evangelists*, and consider also the particular circumstances of *each several case*, will, I am confident, be led to conclude, that in the estimation of those sacred writers, *worship* in its highest sense was due to the Saviour of the World.

I have been led also to notice the attention *apparently* paid (certainly not in any uniform manner) by the *Editors* to the Greek *articles*, as prefixed or not so, to personal and descriptive nouns, by which they have not scrupled to describe the sonship of the Messiah in the low and indefinite terms of *a Son of a God*. The impropriety of this expression is glaring, and if it were not, could settle nothing, because the question turns upon this point only, whether our Saviour was καὶ ἐξ ὁχλῶν, *per eminentiam*, and indeed exclusively **THE SON**  
OF

OF GOD, which undoubtedly in many strong passages he is declared to be, nay \* asserted to be so by Himself.

Such are the points hitherto discussed, (as briefly as I could,) and with a view merely to forewarn the public, that a version of ancient Greek and Jewish writings ought not to be generally received without some inquiry into ancient opinions, and the idioms of the original languages, a wilful disregard of which two circumstances may enable any *man*, or set of men, to mislead the illiterate, and give a plausible appearance to the most erroneous tenets.

I shall next turn to consider those passages of Scripture, which seem to imply the pre-existence of our blessed Saviour; the miraculous conception and birth of the MAN Jesus I have already discussed, but it is plainly to be inferred from the sacred writings, that our Saviour had a previous existence; that as he *came into the world*, and *took flesh* differently from other men, so he had a being long before this particular event took place. The expressions used by several of the sacred writers so certainly imply this, that the literal sense must

\* From a note in Dr. Carpenter's Sermon before the Unitarian Society, I see the title of THE Son of God is supposed to be given to our Lord in the New Testament about thirty times; Son, implying the same thing, about forty times, and Son of God about twenty times. The other titles are all enumerated in the same note, as leading to conclusions not unfavourable to the Unitarian scheme. I confess I cannot see any such conclusions. Had our Lord been called man one thousand times in Scripture, and God but once, yet if the latter instance were unquestionable, it would tell as strongly as the thousand instances in the other case. Mr. C. refers to Schmid as to the rendering of *Kypios* JEHOVAH, but I have no means of examining his work.

be totally abandoned, before we can allowably deny it.

When our Saviour is described by the Evangelist, St. John, as addressing himself to the supreme and eternal God in these terms: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was," we are coldly told in the notes to the present Version, that this was merely the glory of instructing and converting mankind, existing in the *purpose* and *decree* of God: and a number, a great number of passages are referred to, to prove, that it is the idiom of the Scripture language, to describe things existing only in intention, as actually accomplished. Now all this may be really so, in regard to the expressions and passages referred to, but yet, nothing is determined as to the original question, namely, whether Christ had any previous existence. Again; if Christ was (though but metonymically) the Logos of St. John, and St. John expressly says the Logos was "in the beginning," this beginning is peremptorily declared to be the beginning of the Gospel, and the original question is again put out of sight. But could the Evangelist mean to *exclude* the "beginning," of "all things\*;" was it *impossible* that the αρχη of the Evangelist should imply so much as the beginning of the creation. The *beginning* of the OLD Testament in the Greek of ancient Jews is, ΕΝ αρχη ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. The beginning of St. John's history of the New Testament is, ΕΝ αρχη ην ὁ Λόγος—πάντα δι' αὐτῆς ἐγένετο καὶ

\* When St. Paul has occasion to specify the beginning of the Gospel, he does so expressly, ἐν αρχῇ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου. Philipp. iv. 15.



χωρίς αὐτῆς ἐγένετο ὅδε ἐν ᾧ γέγονε\*. The Evangelists, according to the Editors, were bound to explain any terms they used in an unusual or figurative sense, (for so their arguments imply) and yet we are called upon to take up a new and unheard-of meaning for ἐν ἀρχῇ, when used by the Evangelists, though they give us no intimation of such a design. EN APXH, among the Jewish writers before Christianity, meant in the beginning of, or before the Creation, but a Jewish Evangelist, though he gives us no notice of the change, is to be supposed to use these terms in a sense far different, when he says ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος. If there are however, as they would pretend, these difficulties attending the terms ἐν ἀρχῇ, we had better turn to ὁ Λόγος, and see if that can afford us any better ground for our enquiries.

If the Λόγος or *word* of God, was quite a new term to the Evangelists, the use of it must needs be referred to the beginning of the Gospel, as the Editors insist, and may be considered as a mere significative title suitable to the great prophet or messenger of God, who should come into the world. But what shall we say, if the term was no new term at all?—If it was a term undoubtedly in use both among Jews and Philosophers before St. John wrote or even our Saviour was born? What shall we say if we find it to be *an undoubted matter of fact*, that among the Jews especially, an equivalent term had been adopted to express and describe the efficient and active cause of the visible creation. That *such a word* of God, had for many ages preceding, been considered as the visible *Jehovah*, the appearing

\* See Randolph's Vindication of the worship of the Son and Holy Ghost.

God, the *Angel of the Covenant*, the *Shechinah*, or *manifested* glory of God. Should all these remarkable *facts* in ancient history, and that particularly the history of God's select people be *suppressed*? Should the public be kept totally in the dark as to these matters, for fear they should be led to suppose, that the received opinion of Christ's pre existence is correct, or that ancient history can have any thing to do with the question.

It seems to be pretty generally supposed, that whatever was the precise date of St. John's Gospel, when he wrote, three opinions were prevalent in the world concerning the divine word or Logos. Among the Platonic philosophers, it was their *second principle*. With the Gnostics, it was the *offspring* of the *only begotten* of God. Among the Jews, it was the *visible Jehovah*, the *Angel of the covenant*, the *manifested Glory* of God or *Shechinah*, the *Angel of God's presence*. Three conjectures have been started concerning the beginning of St. John's Gospel by those who have been disposed to question his testimony concerning the pre-existence of our blessed Lord. One, that he platonized or borrowed his style from the school of Plato; another, that he borrowed his Logos from the Chaldee paraphrasts; a third, that he meant solely to allude immediately or *by anticipation* \*, to the Gnostic heresies, and therefore understood to shew, that our Lord comprehended in himself, all which they are known to have distributed among their several pretended Æons.

\* See Dr. Lawrence's very learned dissertation on the Logos of St. John, Oxford, 1808. Dr. L. notices a fourth conjecture which I have no occasion to consider at present.

These conjectures alone are sufficient to prove, that it was no fanciful term, merely invented by St. John, *pro re natá*, or even suggested by the Holy Spirit, as a suitable title for a prophet by whom God chose to reveal himself or his word. It was a term diversely understood in the world before St. John began his Gospel. Is it possible therefore that he should have used the term without some express allusion to these prevailing opinions? Had he contradicted them all, it would of course have been a plain proof, that they were all equally fabulous and fanciful, but by *adopting the term* he certainly meant to shew, that the error did not consist in believing that there was a Logos or *word* of God, but in thinking amiss of it. We might indeed have wondered much had he decidedly adopted the *Platonic* or *Gnostic* notions in preference to the Jewish, but that he should harmonize with the latter is by no means surprising; first because he was a Jew himself, and secondly because Christianity was plainly to be shewn to be connected with, and as it were regularly to have sprung out of Judaism. It is certainly then in the highest degree consistent with all we could reasonably expect, to find St. John and others of the sacred writers, expressing themselves in terms not only familiar to the Jews under the old covenant, but which might tend by a perfect revelation of the truth to give satisfaction to all parties, correcting the errors of the *Platonic* and *oriental* systems, and confirming in the clearest manner the hopes and expectations of the Jews. If we suppose, that St. John wrote sixty-eight or seventy years after the ascension of our Lord, we must allow for the prevalence in the intermediate time of much curious enquiry and investigation into the

true character of Christ among all parties. The Gnostics, in the true spirit of their fanciful system, might very naturally fall into the enquiries which seem to be expressed in their different theories; and all which are but so many confirmations of the genuine history of the miraculous circumstances attending the birth and baptism of Jesus. As for instance, whether the *Christ* and *Jesus* were different persons; whether the *man* Jesus was a real man or only a phantom; whether the *Son of God*, and the *Christ*, and the *Logos*, and the *only-begotten*, &c. were not so many separate *Æons*, and the like\*. The Platonic philosophers, so far as we can

\* It has been continually pretended, that what is thought to favour the doctrine of the Trinity and the two natures of our blessed Lord in the evangelical and apostolical writings, was directly pointed against the Gnostics, who had interwoven their strange fancies with the simple truths of christianity. What the Gnostics brought to the Gospel is one thing, what they derived from it another. I confess it has for a long time appeared to me capable almost of demonstration, that instead of the Trinitarian terms (if I may so express myself) being opposed to the Gnostic heresies, the latter are a strong confirmation that the Trinitarian doctrines were expressly taught and countenanced by our Lord and his Apostles. I agree exceedingly with the learned Macknight, in what he says for instance of the Docetæ and Cerinthians, who fell into *opposite* extremes in their opinions concerning Jesus Christ. "It is probable," says he, "that the Apostles taught, and that the first Christians believed Christ to be *God* and *Man*, for if the *Docetæ* had not been taught the *divinity* of Christ, they had no temptation to deny his humanity; and if the *Cerinthians* had not been taught the *humanity* of Christ, they would have been under no necessity of denying his divinity." This, I confess, exactly accords with what has long been my own private opinion, as to all the leading features of the Gnostic heresies; for instance, how came Simon Magus, their great leader, and undoubted contemporary of Christ, and his Apostles, to pretend to be the Supreme God thus distinguished: the *Father* among the Samaritans,



can suppose them at all inquisitive about the matter merely as philosophers, might be expected to enter upon their researches whether the Christ was not their second principle, incarnate, or manifest in the flesh? But the Jews, whose opinions must naturally be considered as of more weight than all the

rest

tans, the *Son* among the Jews, and the *Holy Spirit* among the heathens, if these terms or notions, had not been suggested to him by the Apostles of Christianity, whom he meant both to oppose and rival? How came he (according to Mr. Jones, who places a confidence in the Homilies of Clement of R.) to lay claim to the *Eyw Eµi* of our Lord, so as to induce even *Dositheus* to worship him, unless he had well understood the full force of that remarkable expression, though he might dispute, like others, our Lord's own pretensions to it? Simon undoubtedly had personal communications both with Peter and John, and yet the latter, writing long afterwards, not only records our Lord's own claim to the *Eyw Eµi*, Ch. viii. 58, but in the very outset of his Gospel, speaks of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as real and distinct subsistences, of the *Father*, Ch. i. ver. 18; of the *Son*, verses 18, 34, 50; and of the *Holy Ghost*, ver. 33. Simon certainly seems to have understood that the Apostles taught that God had appeared, *Quasi Filius* inter Judæos (see Irenæus); and this leads to another point which I thank Mr. Jones for suggesting to me. One of the Gnostic corruptions was, it seems, that Christ, who delivered the *new* was not the same with *him* who delivered the *old* covenant; that the God of the Jews was an inferior evil being, and the Demiurgus or Creator, different from the author of the Gospel, and inferior to him in goodness and power. In opposition to these tenets, Mr. Jones cites *Theodore* with great justice and propriety, maintaining that the New and Old Testaments claim the same divine author. Why then may we not suppose St. John had the same great object in view, whether he only designed to set forth the plain matter of fact, or particularly to oppose the Gnostic and other heretics? Why may he not have meant distinctly to show, that the Logos or Word of God, was not only the Creator and Lord of all things, but the author of both covenants, first as the *Angelus Redemptor*, and secondly as actually manifested in the flesh?

rest, (because they alone had possession of those records and traditions, that had any fair pretensions to be considered as revelations, the genuine "*oracles of God*,") had many curious questions to ask, and most particularly concerning the *Logos* or *word of God*. Jealous as they must be presumed to have been of any divine messenger, who should claim authority to break down the partition wall between them and the Gentiles, they would naturally enquire how far it was possible that the communication made by God to the world through his Son could be consistent with his former communications to the Patriarchs and Prophets of their nation \*. If then we take an estimate of the probable opinion of the Jews, when St. John wrote, from the *Targumists*, *Philo*, &c. it is not too much to say, that they *must* have entertained an idea, that the word of Jehovah, the same person who made the world, had been the medium of communication in the days of their forefathers †. That he had actually appeared to the Patriarchs, and in a most peculiar manner presided over the several dispensations under the law ‡.

Though

\* The dialogue with Trypho, by Justin Martyr, is a fair illustration of such supposed enquiries.

† To what extent the terms of the Platonic philosophy were *adopted* by Jews and Christians, is briefly considered in Dr. Lawrence's learned Dissertation, where it will be seen that much more has been attributed to this circumstance in both cases, than the history of facts seems to warrant. See pp. 17, 18, 19, and 77.

‡ I was very glad to find it admitted in the posthumous works of Dr. Priestley, entitled *Notes on the Bible*, that in the angelic appearances to the Patriarchs, one in particular assumed the *character* of the Supreme Being, and was called Jehovah, he does not even scruple to say on Gen. xxxi. 11, "The Angel and Divine Being are here, as on former occasions

Though modern Jews may join with Unitarians in combating these suppositions, our appeal is to facts, to writings more ancient than the records of Christianity, to Jewish interpreters of the Old Testament, and to the judgment of the Fathers of the Church. Whether these notions of the Jews were justly deduced from their Scriptures and from the miracles vouchsafed to them during the Patriarchal and Mosaical government, is no question we need stop to decide; our enquiry has only in view to ascertain whether St. John can be supposed to have used the terms he does in the beginning of this Gospel concerning the Logos, without a particular reference to the notions then prevailing in the Eastern parts of the world. And if this was the case, it could only be in *correction* of them, and *so corrected*, in *confirmation* of them, for the terms so adopted and explained by him, have

the same person." And speaking of Jacob's wrestling with the *Angel*, he says "It is evident that Jacob considers the person whom he denominates an angel, as the same with the Supreme Being, himself, whose representative he must have been," Gen. xlviii. 16. but his note on Exodus xxii. 20. is still stronger to the point, for he there fairly adduces an argument to show that though the Divine Being spoke of *this* angel as distinct, he was yet in effect one with himself.

I know indeed that in his comments on Hebrews i. 2, he expressly says, that "it is evident from that verse alone that the notion which has so long prevailed among christians, that Christ was the person by whom God spake to the Patriarchs, and who appeared to Moses in the bush, has no foundation in the Scriptures, for here the contrary is expressly declared." But the learned Doddridge happens upon the same passage to have a note to the following effect. "This is no argument that God did not speak by Christ before; but only that it was not in so *clear* and *express* a manner." And *Newcome* particularly observes upon ver. 3, that what is asserted of the *Son* there, is true of him *both* when he appeared as the *Jehovah—Angel*, and when he assumed the character of the Messiah.

evidently

evidently that tendency. Had all the parties been wrong in taking up the idea of an active Logos or wisdom of God, a divine Being, principle, or emanation, concerned in the production and formation of all things visible, Could any thing have tended more to fix them in their error\*, than the beginning of St. John's Gospel? ΕΝ αρχη ην ο Λογος, και ο λογος ην προς τον Θεον, και Θεος ην ο λογος. Ουτος ην εν αρχη προς τον Θεον. Παντα δι αυτε εγενετο\* και χωρις αυτε εγενετο εδε εν ο γεγονεν. What error *then* prevalent could possibly have been *corrected* by these terms, had there been actually no ground whatsoever for conceiving, that there had from eternity existed in the godhead, a distinct hypostasis of this nature. I grant these are technical terms, appropriate to a system, but I must use them, only as terms of a certain signification, in case the system can be shown to be rightly deduced from Scripture. I do not mean to prove the system true by these terms, but merely to show that the system of the Evangelist seems to call for such terms; I am not going to define or discuss the exact propriety of the terms, or to show how far they severally apply to the *Jewish*, *Alexandrian*, or *Gnostic* opinions and traditions, but merely to make use of them as known expressions applicable to a Trinity in Unity. I must then have leave to insist upon it, that "a Logos existing from or in the beginning with God, and being God, by whom also all things were made, and

\* So far is St. John, says the learned Scott, from explaining this phrase of the Logos into any different sense from that of the Jewish and Gentile writers, that he all along explains himself in the very same." Scott's Christian Life. Part II. Ch. vii. 339.



without whom was not any thing made that was made," was more likely to meet the ideas of all the several parties, to a certain extent, than totally to obliterate or eradicate such notions, *if erroneous*. And the only question to me would be with which of the prevailing opinions does the text of the Evangelist most evidently agree; and here, independent of every consideration by a mere reference to ancient history, I should for myself have no hesitation in giving it as my decided opinion, that the terms and expressions applied by the Evangelical and Apostolical writers of the New Testament to the person of Jesus Christ, coincide in a marvellous manner with the Jewish traditions, and, (which alone is of principal importance) with the Jewish Scriptures. For I would on no account be understood to rest merely on the conformity of St. John's text to the Chaldee paraphrases, but on the Scripture itself \*. Though I must acknowledge at the

\* In the sixteenth Ch. of the first book of Kings, it is said, the Word of the LORD, (דבר יהוה) came to Elijah and said, What dost thou here Elijah? and Elijah said, I have been jealous for the LORD God of Hosts, [in the original, ליהוה אלהי צב אוח] for the children of Israel have forsaken THY Covenant, and thrown down THINE ALTARS. Let us now suppose that St. John's description of the ΛΟΓΟΣ or WORD of God, had been adduced in explanation of this matter, would it not be natural to conclude, that the WORD of GOD was a Divine Being, having the attributes of JEHOVAH by some ineffable communication and union. The WORD of GOD, came and spake to Elijah, and Elijah addresses him as JEHOVAH SABAOTH the Lord of Hosts, could any Jew then be surprized to learn that this very ΛΟΓΟΣ or WORD of GOD, should afterwards come into the world and be incarnate. If Christ was not this very *Word of God*, this דבר יהוה, he must appear very inferior in the eyes of any learned Jew. Bishop Patrick seems to regard the

the same time that from a comparison of the three on certain points, such strong facts come out, that notwithstanding all objections urged against them, I cannot but consider them as severally illustrative the one of the other. For instance our Saviour, Matt. xxii. 44, Mark xii. 36, Luke xx. 42, expressly appropriates to himself the following passage of the cxth Psalm: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right-hand," &c. This in the Targum of Jonathan according to *Galatinus* and *Fagius* is thus paraphrased, "and the Lord said to his WORD, sit thou on my right-hand," which, as is well observed in the letters of Ben Mordecai, could not be said possibly of any but a *person*, nor could it be said of the *Father*. See also Bishop Bull's first chap. of his *Defens Fidei Nicænæ*. This must appear to meet that great objection of the learned Hackspan as to the use of **טִּמְרָא** as a reciprocal pronoun, for how could it be so construed in the above passage, how could God speak this of and to himself personally, or how could our Saviour claim it unless he was the *Adonai* of the Psalmist, or *Memra dadonai* of the Paraphrast. Should it be objected that Jonathan's Targum on this place is not in existence, let it be recollected that I am only speaking of the Chaldee term of

the WORD of GOD, ver. 9. and the Shechinah, ver. 11—14, as different, but ver. 10. serves to show, that the WORD of the Lord, ver. 9. was the visible Jehovah, appearing first perhaps as an Angel, and afterwards in Shechinah. Admirably does Bishop *Pearson* argue that St. John chose to speak of Christ as the *Logos*, because neither of the names, *Jesus* or *Christ*, would reach to the *Creation*, "therefore," "saith he, "he produceth a name of his, as yet unknown to the world, or rather not taken notice of, though in frequent use among the *Jews*, which belonged unto him who was made man, but before he was so." Fol. 117. .

*Memra*

*Memra dadonai*, which occurs sufficiently often in the other Targums, and so as not to admit of being rendered as a reciprocal, as Bishop Bull has shewn on Onkelos's Paraphrase of Gen. xx. 3\*.

No modern philosophers, no theologians of the present day, can upon the pretence of a more enlightened reason, do away these *evidences*; reason may still object and disdain to submit, but the hand of God is too visible in such co-incidences to be overlooked by persons of deep enquiry, and a sufficient knowledge of antiquity. The notion of a WORD of God, a ΛΟΓΟΣ, prevailed among Jews and Gentiles, before the writings of St. John's Gospel. His account of matter does not agree with the sentiments of the Platonists, (not even with the Jewish Platonist Philo, so as to call Christ *θεῶς* Θεός, though much in agreement with

\* M. Souverain in his *Platonism unveiled*, thinks he has given the Death-blow to this reference, and that it should be read in *Verbo suo* במִּמְרָה, being so in the original paraphrase, and therefore a mere Hebraism: he however admits the term *Memra*, Word. Now our Saviour's reference evidently implies, that God spake to another. All the Evangelists have ΕΙΠΕΝ ὁ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ *εἶπεν ὁ κύριος* μω. The LXX have the same: the Vulgate Dixit Dominus Domino meo, and the Hebrew is נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה לֵאדָנִי. Besides that the latter clause of the verse implies a personal distinction. The question still concerns the *Memra Dadonai*, which expression as Dr. Lawrence has well shown, in its very construction seems to be incapable of passing for a reciprocal. M. Souverain censures Dr. Hammond for citing the Chaldee, לְמִמְרָה, and thinks it is without authority, but Bochart produces a Rabbinical reading to this effect. (See Appendix to Merrick's Psalms.) No. 6. Bochart thinks the Chaldee corrupted in many places; he renders it TO HIS WORD, and understands it of the Messiah. I must confess, I think our Saviour's reference is sufficient authority for this interpretation, if there were no other, but the Jews both before and since our Saviour's time have so understood it. See Pearson, p. 276.

him in other points \*) it does *not* agree with the Gnostic system, except in appropriating to Jesus Christ all those titles they have given to distinct subsistences. But with the Jewish notions it *does* accord, to the correction of all that was amiss in the other systems. It carries us regularly back to those manifestations of the Deity in the Old Testament, to that angel of the presence, or visible JEHOVAH, who bare by authority that ineffable NAME, who spake as God, appeared as God, was worshipped and adored as God.

Whenever I am engaged in these researches I confess, (though I would wish to say it without offence) that I feel astonished at the trifling criticisms of modern Unitarians; the low ideas they seem to have of the Scripture phraseology; and their direct contradiction of plain matters of fact. I can scarcely bring myself to turn to their references, so totally do they seem to carry us away from the real object of discussion. Because for instance, St. John uses  $\alpha\rho\chi\eta$ , in some passages of his Gospel, to express the beginning of his ministry; it is inferred that it *cannot possibly imply more in the first verse of the first chapter*, whereas the real and true question is, not what the general meaning of  $\alpha\rho\chi\eta$  may be, but whether in this particular passage †, St. John could mean less than *that beginning*

\* See an admirable summary of *Philo's* sentiments and expressions in regard to the *Trinity* in the 3d part of Bishop *Kidder's* demonstration of the *Messias*, p. 106.

† Beza has well observed, "Quotiescunque fit Principii mentio, significationem illius ad id de quo accommodare necesse est."—It certainly appears to us, that  $\alpha\tau\ \alpha\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$  is used in quite different senses, in the 1st Epist. of John,—in the 24th verse of the 11th Chapter for instance, as Grotius says,  $\alpha\tau\ \alpha\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$  sumendum est, de tempore, prædicati Evangelii; but in the



*beginning of things*, described in the first chapter of Genesis, when the world was made, according to the Targumists, by the *Memra Jehovah*, or WORD of GOD. *That beginning*, as Grotius insists, “Cum primum rerum Universitas cæpit creari.”

What strange, I must say rather what deceitful criticism, it seems to be to send the unlearned to passages in which the term beginning evidently implies the “beginning” of Christ’s ministry, in order to induce them to believe that St. John could not have intended it in any other sense in the first ver. of his Gospel, though it had been a tradition of long standing both among Jews and Gentiles, that *in the beginning of all things*, God had *created the world* by his WORD or Logos? The learned in the mean while are amused with a critique on the verb γινομαι, which we are told occurs seven hundred times in the New Testament,

the 1st verse of the 1st Ch. “idem tempus notari quod in primis verbis Evangelii Johannis, et in Geneseos.” The present Editors take upon them to tell us that it is otherwise, but we cannot believe them, nor can I help expressing my surprize, that the learned Whitby should think it necessary to interpret απ’ αρχης uniformly throughout these Epistles; because in the 3d chap. of the 1st Epist. ver. 8, it seems manifestly to be used in the sense of the beginning of the world, οτι απ’ αρχης ε διαβολος αμαρτανει, which ought alone to carry any christian back to that beginning of things, when the seed of the woman, was promised to bruise the serpent’s head: I have said so much upon this subject in a former note, that I need not dwell longer upon it at present than to declare it to be my firm opinion, notwithstanding the decisions of many great scholars may be against me, that απ’ αρχης, in the beginning of St. John’s Epistles, expresses the actual pre-existence of that Being who was manifested in the flesh for our redemption, that Being whose εξοδοι or goings forth, were απ’ αρχης, εξ ημερων αιωνος, as Micah terms it.

but

but never in the sense of *create*. To say therefore that all things were *made* (ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ) by the Logos, is wholly inadmissible, as the word ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ never bears that sense. This also is carrying us away from the question. We shall not quarrel with these interpreters if they compel us to discard the term *made*, and adopt their own expression, "that all things were *done* by him," provided they will suffer us to put our own sense upon the other term *πάντα*, upon which the question undoubtedly more immediately depends. We will show then what ideas prevailed in the world among philosophers when St. John wrote, concerning the *πάντα*, or "all things," said to be *done* or *made*, *δια τοῦ λόγου*. All the philosophers, says Amelius, who spake *περί τοῦ λόγου*, spake of it as that principle *καθ' οὗ αἰεὶ οὐσία*, (by WHOM EVER EXISTING,) *τὰ ΓΙΝΟΜΕΝΑ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ*, (all things were made.) Here *τὰ πάντα* seems to be expressed by *τὰ Γινόμενα*, and ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ, can scarcely be said to relate merely to the things *done* by Christ in the Christian dispensation. It has clearly the sense of "*made*," and is applied to the ΛΟΓΟΣ \*, while the *τὰ γινόμενα* of the Philosopher may serve to explain the *τὰ πάντα* of the Evangelist, and must serve to convince us, that the expression of the latter is not too strong, when he adds, that *χωρὶς αὐτοῦ* (without the Λόγος,) ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονε, which Gentile philosophers must have made more of than Christians, even upon the authority of St. John, had he designed merely to limit the term to the Gospel dispensation. I add therefore, that references to other passages of the Gospel in which

\* Tertullian says, we teach that the WORD was the artificer of all things, Ilunc etiam Zeno determinat FACTITATOREM. Apol. c. 21.

the verb *γινομαι* \* happens to be used, are not sufficient to give us the exact sense of it, where the Evangelist applies it to the operations of the Logos. Unless the limitation which these Editors insist upon, had been circumstantially expressed by the Evangelist himself, we must suppose that terms so capable of abuse would rather have been avoided than selected: what an encouragement to the Platonists, to have exalted their Logos far above the great Christian prophet, the man Christ Jesus. How very few words would have obviated all mistakes, had the Evangelist intended to eradi-

\* In the notes on John i. 10, we have another curious critique on the term *εγενετο*—*Και ὁ Κοσμος δι' αὐτοῦ εγενετο*, is rendered, “and the word was *enlightened* by him.” The world was *made*, by him is totally set aside, though adopted by Archbishop Newcome. We are assured that *πεφωτισμενος* is understood after *εγενετο*. This must surely be a misprint, but we see no reason whatsoever for its insertion in any form: Mr. Cappe suggests, by way of getting rid of its obvious sense, that the world *means* the Jewish dispensation, and *δια* with a genitive may express the final cause, and therefore *ὁ κοσμος δι' αὐτοῦ εγενετο* means, *For him the Jewish dispensation was ordained*. At this rate the sentence may mean any thing; for instance, *Κοσμος* sometimes signifies female ornaments or accoutrements, and a proper word inserted *ad libitum*, after *εγενετο*, might make a mere mantua-maker of the Logos; I am not trifling, there is really almost as little sense in Mr. Cappe's emendation, or the correction proposed in the present text. *Εγενετο* requires no word after it, nor need there be any puzzle about *ὁ Κοσμος*. The language of the times, both among Jews and Gentiles, was, “*δι' αὐτοῦ (nempe τοῦ λόγου) συμπας ὁ Κοσμος εδημιουργετο*.” “By the Word, was the whole world made.” *Εδημιουργετο* can never mean *enlightened*, nor, though it is the language of a Jew, is it possible to suppose, that *συμπας ὁ Κοσμος* can mean in this place merely the Jewish dispensation: those who are conversant in the writings of Philo will know how often he attributes the formation and arrangement of the visible world, to the Logos of God. The passages just cited from his writings, the Editors themselves transcribe in a subsequent note.

cate all impressions of this nature, and merely meant to reveal to the world, this simple truth, that Christ was in all things the minister of the Christian dispensation. What an opportunity of correcting all false notions, of an existing Logos or Word of God, the Maker of the world, in the Synagogue, and the schools of Plato, instead of leaving it to be settled by a few dissenting Christians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of the Church: the selection of such terms, under the *then* circumstances of the world, is evidence enough, that neither Jews nor philosophers were wrong, as to that *one* tenet of their creeds, that as there was a first principle in the το Θειον or Deity, so also was there a second principle (ὁ Λογος, ) δι' ὃς ὁ Κοςμος κατεσκευασται, which are *not* the words of a *Christian* but of a *Jew*.

No doubt I shall be thought a great cabalist or mystic by the rational Christians of our day, but I cannot forbear to testify, *that* I do know, and *that* I do think and believe. It seems impossible not to connect the Evangelical and Apostolical accounts of the Messiah, with the particular dogmata of the Jews, Scriptural and *traditional*, for the latter evidence is by no means altogether to be despised; the traditions were not slighted by the writers of the New Testament.

My firm opinion then is, that the Logos of St. John, was the *Jehovah Adonai* of the Jews\*, the

\* The דבר יהוה of Scripture, or מִימְרָא דִּי of the Paraphrasts. Dr. Lawrence has very candidly touched upon one difficulty that seems to stand in the way of this, but offers at the same time, a solution perfectly satisfactory in my estimation: though the word of the Lord, is often decidedly used personally by the Targumists, this is no reason why it should invariably be so.



angel of God's presence, the angel of both covenants, the appearing God. It is thus that we can fairly assimilate the terms of the Old and New Testament, and illustrate the one by the other. When Jehovah appeared in Schechinah to the Patriarchs, it was *ἐν δόξῃ Θεοῦ*, in the glory of God, and is not the Son of God described by the Apostle to the Hebrews, as the *ἀπαυγασμα τῆς δόξης Θεοῦ*? Was not the angel that was sent to the Patriarchs, above every thing distinguished by that most peculiar circumstance of bearing the very NAME of God or Jehovah, a name wholly incommunicable to creatures. "Behold I send *an* angel, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared; beware of *him*, and obey *his* voice; provoke *him* not, for *he* will not pardon your transgressions, for MY NAME is in *him*," Exod. xxiii. 20. This angel is repeatedly spoken of by Moses as JEHOVAH, in a manner the most striking and remarkable. See Gen. xvi. 7—13. Nothing however is more to the purpose than the relation, Exod. iii. The angel of JEHOVAH (or the Lord) appeared to Moses in a flame of fire in a bush. "And Moses said, I will now turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burned; and when JEHOVAH saw, that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush. Moreover he said *I am* the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and Moses hid his face\*." It is very observable that this relation is

\* It is somewhat remarkable, and cannot be made appear in our English Versions, that this title of the Deity in the 3d Chapter of Exodus is thus expressed; "Tell the Children of Israel,

circumstantially preserved in that memorable speech of Stephen, Acts vii. wherein he expressly endeavours not only to convince the Jews, that the Christian dispensation was foretold by Moses, but to satisfy their minds as to the propriety of the legal œconomy being superseded by the *coming* of Christ. It cannot possibly be doubted but that *the* angel of God, under the patriarchal and legal œconomy, had the name of God in him, was called JEHOVAH, spake in the first person as JEHOVAH, called *himself* the GOD of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, appeared in the visible glory of God, was worshipped as God, *yet* we know and are assured upon testimony the most unexceptionable, that no man has seen the *Father* at any time. But this great and ineffable name of JEHOVAH was also by the *Prophets* given to the *Messiah*; the prophecy of Jeremiah we have already cited, in which he declares, that the NAME by which the Messiah shall be called, is JEHOVAH our righteousness \*.

In the xlii<sup>d</sup> ch. of Isaiah JEHOVAH is styled *the* SAVIOUR, and is said to save and redeem in almost every line. “I even I am JEHOVAH, and

Israel, says God to Moses, that JEHOVAH, the ELOHIM of the Fathers, the ELOHIM of Abraham, the ELOHIM of Isaac, and the ELOHIM of Jacob, hath sent me unto you.”

\* See before, p. 41. That Christ, as the visible JEHOVAH, was always the God of Israel, is evident also from a comparison of Isaiah xliv. 6, and Rev. i. 1, or Isaiah xli. 4, and xlviii. 12, with Rev. i. 17, ii. 8, and xxii. 13. In the Prophet, we read, “Thus saith JEHOVAH, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts, I am the First, and I am the Last, and besides me there is no God.” Now this very character of the God of Israel, Christ assumes to himself, in the Revelations, “I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last.”

beside

beside me there is NO SAVIOUR;" but Jesus Christ is declared to be emphatically, THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD, John iv. 42. But it is the NAME of God that we are most particular about. The Hebrew NAMES are well known to have been all significant, so significant, that perhaps there was more of Revelation contained in the Hebrew titles of God, than in any thing else. JEHOVAH alone was indicative of many prime attributes; *Elohim* and *Adonai*, also had their several meanings. It is easy to raise the cry of Cabala, Mysticism, &c. against those who refer to such remote matters, but sacred Scripture is sacred Scripture; we must not give up the Bible; and there is much recondite learning to be derived from thence, when all the *Rhapsodies* of the Talmud, Targumists, and Cabalists are set aside. It may appear cabalistical to insist much upon the twelve lettered name of Rabbi Hakkadosh, or the forty two lettered name expository of the *Arcana Legis*, but it is not cabalistical but scriptural, and strictly so, to lay some stress upon that remarkable passage of Deut. vi. 4, the Lord our God is one Lord. What a difference does it make when we read the original, JEHOVAH our ELOHIM, is ONE JEHOVAH. We cannot get rid of these peculiar expressions. ELOHIM is undoubtedly a very particular expression; it is applied in Scripture as a plural \* noun to the *false Gods* of the Heathens; ap-

\* Dr. *Geddes* has in a most dictatorial manner contradicted the conclusions that have been drawn from this circumstance; he refuses to admit that the word *Elohim*; when applied to the true God, does necessarily denote any plurality at all, much

applied therefore in this *emphatic* manner to the *true* God also, it must be considered as remarkably consistent with *that* doctrine which we conceive to be co-eval with the creation, that in the Godhead of JEHOVAH, there is a plurality, namely, an ELOHIM. It may seem in these days to be a matter of deep research, but truth is *thus only* to be discovered. Truth still lies in a well; a deep one; but not altogether unfathom-

less any plurality of persons; but this decides nothing in the present case, for I contend not *merely* for the *plurality* implied by *Elohim*, but for the indissoluble *Unity* of the ONE JEHOVAH. The purport of *my* remarks is to show that notwithstanding the very *emphatic* manner in which that *Unity* is asserted, the title *Jehovah*, in its fullest acceptation, appears to be ascribed to more persons than one. This then gives the real strength and weight to the *plural* form of *Elohim*, when applied to the true God, and the Unitarians will blunder greatly if they think they derive any advantage from Dr. Geddes's strange comment, so contrary to the sentiments of other eminent biblical Critics, antient and modern, Christian and Jewish. At *all* events it was a word, or form of speaking, to be avoided rather than adopted, from the very circumstance of its having been applied by the *Polytheistical* heathens to their false *Gods*, and yet we find it even in the *second* commandment so directly pointed against *polytheism* and *idolatry*. I *Jehovah* am thy *Elohim*. See *Ben Mordecai*, Dr. *Randolph's* admirable works, and Bishop *Huntingford* on the Trinity, note xxxiii. The plural form *seems* to be *chosen* and *particularly selected*, in order to show that no *plurality* in the true God, infringed the *unity*; a modern writer (Mr. Tomlinson) well observes, why say *Elohim* is ONE *Jehovah*, if *Elohim* is *not* plural? And the learned author of *Horæ Solitariae*, remarks, that such a declaration would have been unnecessary, if the word *Elohim* conveyed one single and similar idea with the word *Jehovah*; while being directed evidently against all idolatry and polytheism, it must have been intended to express that *the plurality* in the real Godhead of *Jehovah* was consistent with the *Unity*. See the Essay on the Trinity annexed to the first Vol. of the *Horæ Solitariae*, 3d Edit. 1804.



able; let us only be patient while we draw it thence. Certain it is, that the great NAME of Jehovah, is by the prophets given to the Messiah, and by implication at least, if not directly, ascribed to Jesus Christ by the writers of the New Testament. Can we wonder then, to find the Apostle to the Hebrews insisting so much on the superiority of Christ, above the Prophets of the Old Testament, describing him as the *brightness of God's glory*, and the *express image of his person*, as sitting on the right hand of the Majesty on High; being made so much better than the ANGELS, as he hath by *inheritance* obtained a more EXCELLENT NAME than they; "for unto which of the ANGELS said he at any time, *sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.*" Hebrews i. Psalm cx. 1. Matt. xxii. 44. And thus does the Apostle to the Philippians speak of the NAME given to the Saviour of the World; "a NAME, which is *above EVERY NAME*;" "that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth, and that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is LORD, to the glory of God the Father." The name Jesus itself, though a common name among the Jews, was yet peculiarly significant, as given to the Christ of God. "And thou shalt call his name JESUS, for he shall save his People from their sins." Matth. i. 21. Luke i. 31. Being the Saviour of God's people, is every where in the Old Testament mentioned as the peculiar work of the Deity. "They pray unto a God that cannot save; there is no God beside me; a just God and a Saviour, there is none beside me." Isaiah xlv. 20, 21. Yet is it said of Christ, that "He is able to save unto the uttermost," yea the Messiah in this  
very

very book, is spoken of as mighty to save; saving by his *own arm*; and by the greatness of his strength. Isaiah lxiii. 1—6. compared with Revelations xix. 15. I am aware that Socinian writers have endeavoured to turn all these passages against us, bringing them forward as proofs, that the name JEHOVAH was given to *created* Angels, Places, Altars, Temples, &c. Of the latter I shall take no notice, as the cases are totally different: it is the application of it to *a person* that I am discussing, and there is nothing apparently more capable of actual proof, than that THE ANGEL in whom JEHOVAH put his NAME, was totally different from those, who, to use the very words of one of these objectors (*Volkelius, lib. 5. de Relig. cap. 9.*) “*ministorum potius aut comitum instar erant,*” from which he himself draws the conclusion, that the particular angel, “*qui solus Dei personam gerebat, et id circo solus ibidem sæpius JEHOVÆ nomine nuncupabatur,*” who alone appeared as God, and therefore was addressed by the name of Jehovah, “*cæteros autoritate anteebat,*” had a supereminent authority distinct from that of his retinue. An authority so truly Divine, that the Jewish Patriarchs did not scruple to render to him divine honours, vows, and sacrifices. Whoever will consult Scott’s Christian Life, Part II. ch. vii. Kidder’s Demonstration of the Messiah, Part III. or the Letters of Ben Mordecai \*, will there find this matter

\* In referring to the learned Author of this work, no doubt, I shall be asked, what I think of his conclusions, both on the subject of the Trinity and the Atonement; I think him wrong as to both, but I admire his learning and talents. I always rise from the perusal of his first Letters, more attached than

matter so fully demonstrated, that no further arguments, I should think, could be necessary. The Socinian conceits are more briefly, but quite as satisfactorily answered in a tract, by the celebrated calvinistical Divine, Nicolaus Arnoldus, entitled *Lux in Tenebris*, Franeker, 1662. See also Mr. Granville Sharp's *Law of Nature*. This great Name of JEHOVAH then, is given to the Angel of God's presence, in the Old Testament, and to no other Angel, or visible Being whatsoever, if we except the Messiah, to whom in the prophecies the same great NAME is assigned, as well as other most significant titles, the value and importance of which will soon cease to be enquired into, or regarded, if the public can once be brought to be satisfied with a version, in which every thing of this sort is as much as possible *suppressed*†.

Because

ever to the Trinitarian doctrines, as deducible from both the Jewish and Christian Scriptures; and as to his Letters on Atonement I have never been at all disturbed by his reasonings, and am now less likely than ever to be so, since the publication of Professor *Magge's* able discourses, and very learned notes in reply to his arguments. Whether the Author judged himself to be a perfect *Apollinarian*, *Arian*, or *Semi-Arian*, I cannot pretend to say, but I think he argues irresistibly in regard to the Messiah being the *Angel of the Covenant*, the *visible Jehovah*, &c. in the first part of his book: and if not altogether orthodox, as to the Trinity, yet he undoubtedly appears to have had strong ideas of the divinity and eternity of the *Son* or *Logos*, and that he was *Jehovah*, and a fit object of *divine worship*; were I to attempt the conversion of the *Jews*, which the Unitarians seem to have so much at heart, I should make more use of the Letters of *Ben Mordecai*, than of any book I ever yet read, but particularly from the pen of any writer of the Unitarian persuasion.

† I may truly say *suppressed*, for who would suppose that after all, their own model Archbishop Newcome, says, in a note part of which the Editors transcribe, that the *Son* was, the

*Mimra*

Because the Greek term *Ἀγγελος*, admits of being rendered Messenger as well as Angel, great endeavours are made to confound our Redeemer with all the *Messengers* or *Prophets* that preceded him, and the utmost distinction allowed him, is that of being the highest of either order of celestial messengers. But there is one remarkable prophecy of the coming of the Messiah, which may admirably serve to shew the real importance of certain Scriptural terms. In the third ch. of Malachi we read, “Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in\*, saith the Lord of Hosts.” This is as it stands in the received text. Now the observations to be made upon it are these: first the person speaking is described to be the Lord of Hosts; it is in the original JEHOVAH SABAOTH. †” “Behold I will send my messenger before ME. Messenger is here proper; it evidently alludes to Elias or his representative rather, John the Baptist, (our Lord himself so applies it, Matth. xi. 10, Mark i. 2, Luke vii. 27.) Before ME is consistent with Isaiah xl. 3. The voice of him that cryeth in the wilderness “Prepare ye the way of JEHOVAH.”—“And the Lord whom ye seek”.—Here in the original it is the ADON or

*Mimra* Jehovah, *Verbum* Jehovah, or Jehovah—the Revealer of his Father’s will under the *Old Covenant*. The *Εξηννητος* or declarer of his will, his image and representative. See his Note on John i. 1.

\* Let the *Jews* attend to *this*.

† Nobody believing the New Testament, will deny that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of the World, but says Isaiah xlvii. 4. The NAME of our REDEEMER is JEHOVAH SABAOTH.—*Horæ Solitariae*.

JEHOVAH



JEHOVAH ADONAI, him whom David called his Lord (as our Saviour himself remarked) Psalm cx. 1, shall suddenly come to HIS temple, the temple of Jerusalem, that is, the temple of God, the temple of the Lord of Hosts! Even the messenger of the covenant; *angel* of the covenant would undoubtedly have been more proper. The *angel* of the covenant was the visible JEHOVAH; no common angel, “not an angel in that low sense in which it is objected to the Arians, as if they believed him but little superior to mankind, but as he is represented by Paul and Stephen and Moses, superior to all angels, who are under his command and pay worship to him. (Heb. i. 6. 9.) Who is declared by Moses to be the glory of God, and the similitude of God, and by the christians to be the brightness or ray of his glory, and the express image of his person, and the whole of his character, as it is described Exodus xxxi, is particular and personal; and designed to distinguish him from all other angels, and as superior to them. For it is the glory of *one particular person* that was discovered; and the moral attributes of *one particular person* which are there specified\*.”

“Taking

\* Ben Mordecai's Letters, ii. 19. And the same learned writer, speaking of this very prophecy of *Malachi*, Letter vi. p. 66, says, “These are the *last* words of the *last* of our Prophets: and these being claimed by Jesus Christ to refer to John the Baptist and himself, connect the *old* revelation with the *new* one; and prove the *Christian* scheme to be only a continuance and farther completion of the original design of God, to bring men to eternal life by his Son, Jesus Christ, the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, the *Adon* or Lord of the Temple; who was foretold by the prophets under the character of *Jehovah*; who led our fathers out of *Egypt*, that *He* should return and dwell with them, and make a *new covenant* with them. It is  
the

“Taking then these Scriptures together,” says another learned writer \*, “it appears that the promised Messiah was the expected ADON, and being the ADON of the temple (or of his people,) he was therefore JEHOVAH; and that consequently he is styled in the communion of the sacred Trinity ADONAI JEHOVAH. Instances of this truth,” he adds, “might be multiplied, if necessary; but probably these will suffice to satisfy every believer, that he is not worshipping a mere man as the Socinians dream: nor an inferior God as the Arians maintain, but JEHOVAH Elohim in the human nature, and united to the visible form of Jesus of Nazareth †.”

This is the sort of knowledge which the Unitarians despise as cabalistical, mystical and unintelligible, but it is purely scriptural. It is capable of being understood without the illustrations of Targumists or Rabbins. It is to be found in the Bible, in the very words and terms of Scripture; it may be obscured or misrepresented, but it cannot be annihilated. The Logos of St. John is not to be sought for in the writings of Platonic Philosophers or Platonic Fathers, except as far as their Logos agrees with the ADONAI JEHOVAH of the Jews, the

the completion of this prophecy, that begins the Christian dispensation: the promise being literally fulfilled, when *Christ* appeared in the character of *Messiah*, the Son of Man, and Prince of Peace.”

\* See *Horæ Solitariae*, 3d Edit. Vol. i. 64.

† Sometimes, says Bishop Chandler, (speaking of the Divine WORD) “he is indeed treated as an *Angel* or *Messenger*; but even then is so distinguished from all other angels in respect of majesty, authority, and power, or dignified with the incommunicable title of JEHOVAH, that they had not the least thought of his being a mere angel.” Sermon before the King, 1718.

angel

*angel of the covenant, the angel of God's presence.*

These are the titles under which we must search for the true Logos of St. John; not that I should disclaim to refer to Jewish commentators upon such a subject, if we needed their help; but Grotius has almost done this for us sufficiently in that *short* chapter of his book *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, B. V. 21. (Much also to the same effect may be found in Witsius Misc. Vol. ii. de Michaelæ.)

The following testimony however, produced by Grotius out of the comment of R. Moses the Son of Neheman on the 5th chap. of Joshua, is too much to the purpose to be passed by. Speaking of the angel who presided over the Jewish dispensations, he says, "Iste angelus, si rem ipsam dicamus," "that angel, to say the truth, is the ANGEL REDEEMER, (*angelus Redemptor*) of whom it is written, for my NAME is in him. He was the angel who said to Jacob, I am the GOD of Bethel. Of whom it is said, GOD called to Moses out of the midst of the bush; he was called an angel because he governs the world. For it is written, JEHOVAH (that is, the LORD GOD,) brought us out of Egypt. And again, the angel of GOD's presence saved us, and without doubt the angel of *God's* presence was he of whom it is said, MY PRESENCE shall go before thee, and I will give thee rest. In a word, he is the angel of whom the prophet spake, the *Lord* whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the ANGEL of the COVENANT whom ye delight in."

If these were the opinions and expectations of the Jews, how intelligible would the beginning of St. John's Gospel be to them, if, laying aside all thoughts of the Platonic or Gnostic systems,

systems; we were to substitute for the term *Logos*, the *angelus redemptor*, or angel of the covenant. It would then be altogether consistent with the descriptions given in the Old Testament of the visible JEHOVAH, as well as of the Messiah, and the titles by which each is distinguished. "In the beginning was the *angelus redemptor* or ANGEL of the *covenant*; and the *angel of the covenant* was with God, and the angel of the covenant was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the ANGEL of the COVENANT was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his GLORY, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of *grace and truth*."

Instead of any reference of this nature to a pre-existent Being, whose coming in the flesh had been particularly foretold by all the Jewish Prophets, these Editors, I am sorry to say, so confound matters, as to mislead both Jew and Christian. The *Word* they make a mere title given to Jesus, as the revealer of God's word\*. In the beginning, is the beginning of his ministry. That the word was God, signifies that he withdrew from the world previous to his ministry, and went into retirement more freely to commune with his Maker. And this is actually illustrated by a reference to Exodus xxxiv where Moses is said to have been with *God* in the Mount; which presence of God every Jew ought to know was the visible Jehovah, in fact

\* They quote Archbishop Newcome for this, as I have observed, but without noticing his subsequent remarks, which are in conformity to what is here advanced.



Christ himself. “*And the word was God:*” καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, for want of the article before Θεός, they render, and the word was *a* God, rejecting Archbishop Newcome’s reading, “*was God,*” which of course they put in the margin. References are made, as we might expect, to that mode of speaking among the Jews, by which those are called Gods to whom the word of God came, and to which our Saviour himself particularly alluded, John x. 35; but it should at least be noted, that our Saviour’s argument which he draws from it, evidently tends to exalt his own title far beyond these, and it can scarcely be held to imply less than this plain matter of fact: “If they were styled Gods, to whom the *word* of God only came, and with whom he conversed, can I who am this very Λόγος be said to blaspheme, in saying that I am the Son of God.” And then referring to his miracles, “If I do not the works of my FATHER, believe me not:” but say the Editors, his argument only tended to shew that he was a God, like other prophets to whom the word of God came. Then it was a very weak argument surely, since the Jews so little understood it, that after they had heard it, they renewed their charge of blasphemy, and again sought to take him, in order to stone him, so that he was obliged miraculously to escape from them; but *two* grammatical emendations are suggested; “some translate the passage, God was the Word, and Crellius *conjectured*, that the true reading was Θεὸς, the Word was God’s.” These emendations have long been known. The latter, *however plausible*, the translators reject, as of *no authority*; the former they do not find fault with. The mention of either is a plain proof that the original appears against them, but there is actually a rule among dialecticians

cians which would secure to us the true reading. It is thus expressed by an eminent critic, “*Nam dictio, quæ habet articulum, apud Græcos est, ut aiunt dialectici, in oratione subjectum, seu prima pars.*” The Word, that is, to which the article is prefixed must be the subject of the sentence, so that “*God was the Word,*” would be a perfect perversion of the text, and though true in a certain sense, by no means equivalent to the real import of the Greek. “*Itaque, (thus Beza concludes his note upon it,) ut vitaremus periculosam amphiboliam, quæ non est in Græco sermone, naturalem ordinem constructionis secuti, priore loco subjectum, posteriore attributum collocavimus.*” The translators have added an article to Θεός in this passage, “*The Word was a God.*” I have had occasion to notice such insertions before\*.

“*By*

\* God forbid that I should be wilfully ludicrous upon such a subject; but so very strange do the comments of modern Unitarians appear to me, when pretending to expound matters according to the *Jewish Phraseology*, they would insist upon it, that the *Unitarian sense* of the *Proem* of St. John’s Gospel must have been so obvious *from the first*, as that *none* could mistake it, that I could scarcely express what I feel upon the subject, otherwise, than by contrasting the above simple Paraphrase, in which I have substituted the *Angelus Redemptor* for the *Logos*, with the perplexed account of matters as explained by the Unitarians.

We may then fairly suppose *their* Paraphrase to run thus—*Εν αρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος*—“*In the beginning was the Word.*”—By the beginning I by no means intend the beginning of the Creation, or of all things, but merely the beginning of the Gospel dispensation. I do not *specify* this to be my meaning, because I conclude you will perceive it, though I know well enough, that I express myself exactly as though I *did* mean it, and that *another* beginning *must* be present to *your* minds, when *the world was made*, by the *Logos* or *Word* of God; however I certainly do *not* mean this; I mean to make no sort of allusion to any thing

“By him was life.” “In him was life,” says their model Archbishop Newcome, but his rendering

thing you may happen to know, or have previously heard, of the *Logos* or *Word* of God, by whom the world was made; but I mean merely to give this appellation to *Jesus Christ*, a man like myself, because he was commissioned to reveal the *Word* of God, (that is in Greek, the *Λόγος*,) to mankind: it is what grammarians and rhetoricians would call a *metonymy*; I do not tell you this in my gospel, because, notwithstanding any prejudices to the contrary, I think you must know it by *instinct*.

—Καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.—“And the Word was with God;”—that is, *not* with him really or personally, but how do you think? why in the way of *retirement* or *private communion*, as might be the case with you or me or any other man. Do not fancy he was really *with* God, though I say so; there is something implied under the preposition *πρὸς* which I do not stop to explain to you, because I conclude that you, and every convert that comes after you, however unacquainted with the Greek language, *women* and *children*, will easily comprehend what I mean by *instinct*.

Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.—“And the Word was GOD.”—Do not mistake me, I mean *God was the Word*; though contrary to grammar, depend upon it this is my particular meaning; or if you do not like this, mind that *Θεός* has in this place *no article* before it, therefore at the utmost it can only imply that the *Word* was A God, perhaps you will think *Jupiter* or *Mercury*: not so, but yet A God, one, in short, of the Jewish *Elohim*; but take special care you do not account it one of the *Elohim* spoken of Deuteronomy iv. 4, for of course *it is impossible* I should mean any such thing, though indeed I know that you have been brought up to believe that the Word of God was the *appearing Jehovah*, and therefore might reasonably be accounted one of the *Elohim*, which God himself has told us, constitutes ONE *Jehovah*; but had I meant to describe him to be *Jehovah*, I should, you may be sure, have put the definite article before *Θεός*, and called him ὁ Θεός, a distinction which in no manner belongs to him. Though indeed I well know that St. Matthew has blundered so greatly as to deceive you in this particular, when he tells you that the Messiah was to be GOD WITH US, that is, in *our* language, *Emmanuel*, in the blundering Greek of St. Matthew, μετ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός.—This may not strike

ing is *refused*. The Greek is ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ, which the Editors explain, "he was the Revealer of life," referring to John vi. 68, &c. The Evangelist, I will venture to say, intended much more than this, that he was in fact "the Fountain of life, to the whole creation," as Doddridge expresses it. That he had; (as the Evangelist himself says in another place,) equally with the Father, ΖΩΗ ΕΝ ΕΑΥΤΩ, "*Life in himself*," ch. v. 26. "There was a man sent from God." These few words of the Evangelist the Unitarians would have written in gold: this illustrates, they say, ver. i. 2. To be sent *from* God implies that he had been first *with* God; therefore John came down from Heaven as truly as the divine Logos. John was as truly from above, as truly with God in the beginning, as truly came forth from God when he came into the world, as the blessed Jesus: so says their great authority Mr. Cappe; but what does John the Baptist himself say? Why, that so far from being upon any footing of equality with him, whose forerunner he was appointed to be, "*He that cometh from above, saith he, is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from Heaven is above all: how*

strike you at first sight, but depend upon it, he never meant *Jehovah*, he only meant a God in some way or other as *I* do; do not therefore on any account attend to *his* insertion of the article, mind only *my* omission of it.

I dare not proceed, though I am sorry to say, ideas still more strange crowd in upon my mind, but ridicule is no test of truth one way or the other, and I should scorn to use it, especially upon such a topic, otherwise than to show, by some such brief specimen, how nearly it borders upon an actual *absurdity*, to suppose, that a *Jewish* Evangelist could in those days have so expressed himself, subject to the interpretation which Unitarians now put upon his words.

above



above all\*, if he himself and every other prophet came from Heaven, and came from above, in like manner

\* A few things here deserve to be brought together, 1st. John was certainly comparing Christ with himself, i. e. with his forerunner, but the forerunner of the Messiah was the forerunner of JEHOVAH, Isaiah xl. 3. Malachi iii. 1. Here he says, Christ is ABOVE ALL, but who except the God of Israel JEHOVAH can properly be said to be ABOVE ALL: compare Psalm lxxxiii. 18. Besides this, St. Paul calls Christ, if not ὁ Κύριος ἐξ ὐρανό 1 Cor. xv. which is somewhat doubted, yet at least, τὸν κυρίον τῆς δόξης THE LORD OF GLORY. 1 Cor. ii. 8. See Sharp on the Law of Nature. I would ask, whether John's testimony that Christ was ABOVE ALL, ἐπάνης πάντων, is not a strong confirmation of the common Version and reading of Romans ix. 5. ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων κ. τ. λ. Archbishop Newcome is curiously cited upon this place. The learned Primate remarks, "If coming from above, or from heaven, be meant *only* receiving a divine commission: then John came from above, or from heaven, as well as Jesus." This remark of the learned Primate, say the Editors, is perfectly just; accordingly the Baptist is said to have been sent from God, ch. i. 6. and his *Baptism* to have come from Heaven. Matth. xxi. 25. Mark xi. 30. Luke xx. 4. Thus then the Primate, as well as John the Baptist, is made to express the very things he intended not. Both unquestionably meant to imply, that the mission and authority of Jesus far exceeded that of the Baptist, and to use the very words of the latter, that the one was from Heaven, the other from the Earth: for the latter clause of the comparison is made light of, and scarcely noticed, but if they would refer to some of their own authorities, they will find that it plainly relates to the earthly origin of the Baptist; *Natus secundum Adami legem*, is Grotius's expression, whom they refer to, and Doddridge whom they cite in a former note, paraphrases it, "he that is born like me, in a natural way." Besides their references to the Baptism of John, Luke xx. 4, where our Saviour asks, the Baptism of John, was it from heaven or from men, &c. is ill-chosen, and their gloss upon it still worse; "observe here," say they, "that coming from Heaven signifies, not local descent, but being of divine authority;" for if they will turn back to Luke iii. 21, 22. they will find, that according to their own Version, there was

at

manner. The Editors determine not to see this inconsistency, they continually insist upon it, that Christ no more descended personally from Heaven

at the *Baptism of Jesus*, both a *bodily appearance*, and a local descent of the spirit from Heaven, *ὡσεὶ περιπαρῶν*, and “a voice from Heaven besides, saying, THOU art MY BELOVED SON!” One would scarce believe, (but it is true,) that in another place, the Editors insist upon this visible appearance and audible voice, in strong terms, to support an argument, and to justify a new reading, in doing which they expressly, and in terms, acknowledge a local and visible descent of *the Spirit of God*. This is to be found in their note on John v. 18. chap. viii. 42. Our Saviour says, “I came forth from God.” This the Editors say, is explained in the next clause, “*he sent me,*” as his messenger, *that is*, and Revealer of his will to man; and they refer us to chap. i. 6, “There was a man sent from God whose name was John.” Thus it is that they persist in confounding what the Baptist, the Evangelist, and Jesus himself have in the strongest manner endeavoured to distinguish. The Baptist, says, he himself was from the Earth, but Jesus from Heaven; the Evangelist records abundance of comparisons to this effect, and assures us, chap. xx. 31, that his sole object in writing his Gospel was to shew, that Jesus was *the Christ, the Son of God*; and our Saviour himself declares, that no man but himself had seen the Father; and yet we must merely regard him as a Prophet, no otherwise sent from Heaven than John was, no otherwise the Son of God than the Evangelist himself, no otherwise known to the Father than as his inspired messenger: but if we consider the foregoing note, and compare Scripture with Scripture, we shall have further proof of their inconsistencies. To be sent from the Father it seems, implies not any local descent from heaven, as we may see by the terms in which John’s mission is mentioned, John i. 6: now in John xiv, 26, it is said, “But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, which the *Father* will send in my name, he shall teach you all things. But when the Holy Spirit *was sent* by the Father to sanctify Jesus at his Baptism, the Editors admit a local descent and bodily appearance; and this Spirit was clearly not the Father, though they insist upon it that the Spirit of God is God; in chap. xvi. 7. *this very Spirit*, (our Saviour says,) I will send unto you, and he did so by a visible descent from Heaven on the day of Pentecost.

than

than John the Baptist, and yet that the latter meant to show, by *these very expressions*, that the character and powers of Christ were super-eminent. They omit no opportunity of comparing the mission of the Baptist with the mission of our Saviour; if the former is said to have been "*sent from*" God, so is the latter, therefore they would infer, (indeed they insist upon it,) that if the latter came down from Heaven, so did the former, but as they know that the former did not personally descend from Heaven, so are they sure that the latter could not have done so: though the Baptist himself expressly draws that comparison between them, "he that is from above," and "he that is from the earth," yet will they positively assert, that his expressions, imply, that he that was from above was only from the earth, and he who was from the earth, undoubtedly came down from Heaven. If John was sent *from* God, he must have been *with* God, says their expositor Mr. Cappe. What then does our Saviour tell us of those who come *from* God in the way he himself came from God? "No man hath seen the Father, but he that is *from* God, (so the Editors render John vi. 46.) *ατος*, this person, this *one* person (for it is in the singular,) He hath seen the Father." Whether this *one* person was John the Baptist or the blessed Jesus, we leave the reader to determine.

It is a question, that surely needs no Elias to resolve it, though the Elias of the New Testament, John the Baptist himself, would surely have represented every doubt upon the subject; however, they make an effort to get over this; to "*see the Father, is to know his will,*" we are told in the notes, and are referred back to v. 4, of the same chap. and to v. 9 of chap. xiv. These references, however,

however, upon other occasions, cannot resolve the principal question, which is, in what manner Christ came *from* God, so as to be unlike all other prophets. The Editors tell us, to come *from* God is to be *commissioned* by Him, as for instance, John the Baptist was; but here they deviate something from the text, rendering  $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta\ \delta\ \omega\upsilon\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ , he that is *from* God, though the passage is exclusive, and plainly distinguishes the blessed Jesus, from all other Prophets whatsoever; and we have nothing but the positive contradictions of the unitarian party, to prove to us, that though he says himself, he came from Heaven, he certainly did not come from Heaven; though he declares he had seen the Father, he certainly had not actually seen the Father, though he assures us that He in a most *peculiar* and *singular* manner came forth from God, ( $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\chi\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\upsilon$ , a strong and singular expression) he certainly came from him no otherwise than like the prophets of old, and his own immediate fore-runner. But in one place these critics seem to be caught in their own traps. The whole dispute rests upon what is to be understood literally and what figuratively. If this is to be left to the arbitrary determination of every critic, what confusion must needs ensue. Here then, if anywhere, we ought to look for some established canons of criticism. Now the Editors think they furnish us with one, upon this very subject. When our Saviour saith, chap. viii. 23, "Ye are from beneath, I am from above," they dispute the inference of Archbishop Newcome (their model,) that "this clause is expressive of a local residence in heaven, antecedent to his existence on earth;" because, as the first clause must be understood figuratively, so *must* the latter also: but when the Evangelist, (whose sense of matters in general the Editors would be thought to respect)



writes thus ; “ Now Jesus having known, that his hour was come, that he should depart out of this world to the Father, though he knew, I say, that the Father gave all things into his hands, and that he *came from God*, and was *going to God* ;” this canon of criticism must needs be laid aside to answer their purposes. Alas ! not so. It is a rule only to restrain Archbishops. They openly violate it now it tells against them ; and hoping their readers may lose all recollection of matters between the pages 226 and 242, they deliberately explain it thus in their notes ; “ he came from God,” (which is the first clause of the verse,) “ as his messenger to the world ;” that is, *figuratively*, as John did, to whose mission they again expressly refer ; viz. chap. i. 6, but, “ he was going to God,” the last clause of the verse, we must surely have leave to understand literally, for they do not discredit his death, resurrection or ascension ; they acknowledge, “ he was (*literally*) going to God, to give an account of his charge, his public mission and ministry being closed.” Thus it is, that the Editors undertake to render the New Testament “ generally intelligible,” by sending us from the figure, to the letter, and from the letter to the figure, as from pillar to post, and from post to pillar. The two clauses of the verse before us cannot be reduced to their canon, without rendering both of them literally, because nothing could be more literally true than that Christ was about to ascend personally to his Father in Heaven \*. “ So then, after

\* Chap. xvi. ver. 28, is still stronger against them according to their own canon. “ *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world. Again, I leave the world, and go to the Father ;*” and yet they forget themselves so much as to assert in a note on the very next verse, that *coming forth from the Father*, is to be taken *figuratively*.

after the Lord had spoken to them, he was taken up into Heaven, and sat on the right-hand of God," Mark xvi. 19. Whatever figure of speech there may be in this passage, the Unitarians never doubt of the literal ascension \* and glorification of the crucified Jesus; they ought not therefore according to their own rule to doubt of his actual descent from Heaven, which is quite as fully ex-

"He hath a demon and is mad." John x. 20. These words, say the Editors, express cause and effect; he was *literally* mad, they acknowledge, but that he had a demon, is so bold a *figure*, it seems, that *nothing can be more absurd than the mere supposition of such a cause.*

\* In their note on John vi. 62, they observe, "to ascend where he was before, is, as all interpreters agree, to ascend to heaven," but they pretend still that to the *Son of Man*, this can apply only figuratively. Christ then surely must have been literally the Son of God, in order to have literally so ascended to heaven, and if one clause of a verse is to determine the character of both, this was, where he *literally* was before: St. Paul himself, indeed, seems to have settled that where the ascent and descent of Christ are thus brought together, both *must* be taken literally; Ephesians iv. 9, 10, for though Commentators differ as to the meaning of the lower parts of the Earth, yet they are agreed that it must be taken literally whether it alludes to the incarnation or death of Christ: see Doddridge. That it is not a figurative expression, for his descent into Hell, Bishop Pearson argues at length in his fifth Article of the Creed: see also Beza in Loc. Grotius's comment is, *Etiam Deus, de quo sensu primum obvio agit Psalmus, primum descenderat sed in Montem Sinai: Christus vero multo inferius in eam partem, in qua homines solent vivere; and it is singular enough that in proof of this actual descent of Christ, he refers to those very passages wherein these Editors assure us no actual descent is spoken of, as John iii. 13; vi. 33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, &c.*

It is well worth while for the reader to turn to Scott's Christian Life, Part II. chap. vii. vol. 2, where he will see, how admirably that very learned and excellent writer argues from this reference to Psalm lxxviii, that Christ must have been the Angel JEHOVAH, who so often appeared to the Patriarchs and gave the Law from Mount Sinai.

pressed in the first clause of this verse, as his death, resurrection, ascension, and glorification, are in the last member of it.

“Καὶ ὁ Λόγος σαρκὶ ἐγένετο.” This is rendered “and the Word was flesh,” literally and correctly enough. The received text, however, and Archbishop Newcome’s rendering are rejected, “the Word was *made* flesh,” and “the Word *became* flesh” (which latter is the primate’s rendering.) But an amendment is proposed in the notes, as, “*nevertheless* the Word was flesh;” that is, say the Editors, “though this first preacher of the Gospel was honoured with such signal tokens of divine confidence and favour, though he was intrusted with so high an office he was nevertheless a *mortal* man!!”—Cappe. We are glad to see that they are willing to admit, that it was something surprising that he should be a mortal man; it must also be as surprising therefore that he “should dwell among us;” but how or where was he to dwell otherwise, if a mere man? It could not be surprising that the man Jesus should dwell among his fellow-creatures, but surprising enough it was that the divine Logos should do so. This “*nevertheless*” therefore we will admit, if they will allow us to give it its proper force, and read it thus—“nevertheless the divine Logos, that was in the beginning with God, and that was God, and who made the world, was man also, that is, took flesh, and dwelt among us.” This must be the proper force of the *Evangelists* “*Nevertheless*,” if that is to be the rendering of καὶ, for the tokens of distinction particularly enumerated by the Evangelist are, that “the Word was actually in the beginning with God; and was God.” A God only indeed, the Editors say, but that would give the same force to their “*nevertheless*,”

ness," for the question is, how could a *God* become a *man*? But the Evangelist goes on to say, "and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." Here then another, "nevertheless" might be necessary. For if it was wonderful that the Logos should be man, it was equally wonderful that a man should be the Logos of God, or shine in the glory of his only begotten Son. The great question is, what was *that* glory of which the Evangelist speaks? Now in the language of those times, most unquestionably, "the glory of the only begotten of the Father" was the visible JEHOVAH, whom Philo the Jew calls the SON OF GOD, and the FIRST BEGOTTEN of the Father before all creatures, and the WORD of GOD; and *His* glory was the *Shechinah* or *δοξα* mentioned so often in the Septuagint translation. The particle *ὡς* (as) Piscator and others tell us\*, does not here signify *similitude*, but *reality* and *certainly*; the sense of the words therefore must be, "we beheld his glory, (*ὡς*) *namely*, the glory or *Shechinah* of the only begotten of the Father; and, as Dr. Hammond explains it, *such a glory* as was incompatible with any *other* but the *true eternal Son of God*; and this seems to be the right meaning †."

I have observed, that the Editors set aside the received text, "and the Word was *made* flesh." They will never allow *γενέσθαι* to imply so much, because *γίνομαι* does not signify to *create* ‡, but to

\* See Whitby.

† Ben Mordecai's Letters.

‡ Mr. Simpson, in his Essays on Scripture language, points out three instances in which *γίνομαι* is used in the sense of proper creation, viz. James iii. 9; Hebrew xi. 3; iv. 3; and I have the authority of an Unitarian to say that the first and third appear to be in point. See Monthly Repository for April.



*be.* The *being* however of a thing *made* includes the *making*. When it is said above, Καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ κόσμος ἐγένετο, if ὁ κόσμος means the visible world \*, ἐγένετο, which points to the efficient cause of it, must include the act of creation. We are not alarmed therefore at the omission of this little word, if we may but trust to the wisdom of our readers to discern, that if the Logos was a pre-existent being, σαρχὲς ἐγένετο must imply an extraordinary assumption of the human nature. To vindicate our own venerable translators, however, for the insertion of a word, which these very scrupulous contemporaries seem so alarmed at, we must declare that it seems to us, that it could not with any propriety have been omitted, by persons at all acquainted with the writings of the ancient Fathers of the Church; especially of those who lived so near the times of the apostles, as Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian. The first speaks of our Lord, as ἐν σαρχὶ γενομένου Θεοῦ. Justin Martyr calls him the Son and Λόγος, ὃς ΣΑΡΚΟΠΟΙΗΘΕΙΣ ἈΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ. Irenæus, Deus igitur Homo FACTUS est. And Tertullian, Christus vere Hominem indutus, Deus Perseveravit. Christ putting on the manhood, remained God. Surely this is more conformable to the language of the Evangelist than the gloss of the Editors. Tertullian says, that though Christ put on the manhood, *nevertheless* he continued GOD. The Editors say, that though St. John assures us that Christ, (for the Logos they account a mere metonymical title,) was in the beginning with God, and was a God, *nevertheless* he was mere man; and the only thing we have to in-

\* Newcome paraphrases thus: the visible, material world was created by him. Ὁ Κόσμος is more determinate than οἱ ἄνθρωποι, &c.

duce us to accede to their view of matters, is, that Dr. Priestley has pronounced all the passages referred to in the ancient Fathers to be corruptions of Christianity, derived from the schools of Plato. But our enquiries go farther back. We wish to know whether they are corruptions of *Judaism*, for upon these points we consider *Judaism* and *Christianity* to be mutually illustrative of each other, and we can easily separate what belongs purely to the school of Plato, from the doctrines of the Synagogue and the Church. We go back far beyond the *Logos* of Plato, to the *angel of God's Presence* in the Pentateuch, and we can do so in the company of one of those very *Platonic* fathers, who stands so suspected, but who happens to describe matters exactly as we should collect them to be, *from Scripture*, in its original purity, unmodernised by rational Hebreans and Grecians. Thus then Clemens Alexandrinus expresses himself concerning the WORD OF GOD,—“ the WORD is the FACE of GOD, by whom he manifests himself, and makes himself known. The ancients had the Old Testament, and the law instructed then by fear, and the WORD was an ANGEL, Λογος Αγγελος ην. But the new people hath received the New Testament, και Λογος γεγεννηται, and the WORD is MADE or BEGOTTEN; and the fear is turned into love, και ο μυσικος εκεινος Αγγελος τικτεται, and that mystical angel is born.” *Pædag. Lib. 1. cap. vii.*

Great objections are made to the use of the term *Μονογενης*, or rather to the English received translation of it, which Mr. Lindsey pronounces to be most gross and improper. We must say it seems to us almost unavoidable if we would give a literal rendering of the Greek, which in a descriptive title ought surely to be done: however as the

Editors

Editors seem not unwilling to allow that it is jointly with the other expression  $\delta \omega \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma \tau \omicron \nu \kappa \omicron \lambda \pi \omicron \nu \tau \epsilon \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho \varsigma$ , a token of such favour and such intimate "*communion with the Father*" as has never been enjoyed by any of the *sons of men*," (which are the very words of their own favourite referee, Mr. Cappe,) their objections cannot affect the main question, viz. What was the precise nature of that singular and most extraordinary communion, as to the existence of which we all agree \*? *We* say it consisted in being, "*one with the Father*," as our Saviour himself declares so *intimately and inseparably*, that as he further explains it, the one cannot act without the other. "My father worketh hitherto, and I work, what things soever he *doeth*, these *doeth the Son likewise*." Some Socinians have judged it to consist in our Saviour's having been actually taken up into Heaven before the commencement of his ministry, in order to be personally instructed by God the Father, in all things appertaining thereto. The Unitarians of the present day, with the Editors of this Improved Version, are certain that it merely consisted in our Saviour's going into retirement, to *commune* with his God, "The Word was with God," say they, "implies no more than that Jesus with-

\* The learned Parkhurst, contrary to the opinion, as he confesses himself, of many great and good men, conceives that the term  $\text{Μονογενής}$  does not relate to the divinity, but to the humanity of Christ, and is of course a direct reference to the miraculous conception. As the Editors however seem to exult in the term being applied to Isaac, who was not in fact the only-begotten Son of Abraham, we cannot help noticing another sense which has been given to it, viz. the only genuine Son (of God), Isaac appearing to have been so styled in opposition to his spurious brother Ishmael. Heb. xi. 17; Gal. iv. 30. At all events the application of the term to Isaac was right, as far as regarded his mother Sarah. See more upon this term below.

drew from the world into the wilderness to commune with God, and be instructed and disciplined for his high office." They should have added, as any other mere man or prophet might have done; for there was no singularity in such communications. Many of the ancient prophets received their revelations in retirement, Ezekiel on the Banks of the Chebar, and Amos in the Wilderness of Tekoah, Daniel in the Lions Den, and Jonah in the outskirts of Nineveh, Elijah by the Brook Cherith, and the Baptist himself in the deserts of Judea.

At the close of the notes on the first chapter of St. John we are favoured with Mr. Lindsey's Version. "In the beginning was wisdom, and wisdom was with God, and God was wisdom, &c.\*"

I have

\* Mr. Lindsey, it seems, would substitute WISDOM for the Logos. This emendation then ought to help us to the proper rendering and sense of *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, for in the Book of Proverbs, we happen to have an account of the *eternity* of WISDOM, in the following words. *Κυριος—πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμέλιωσε με, ἐν ἀρχῇ, πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ τὰς ἀβύσσους ποιῆσαι, πρὸ τοῦ προελθεῖν τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων, πρὸ τοῦ ὄρει ἐδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βενων γεννα με.* We read nothing here of the beginning of the Gospel ministry. Let then the Logos stand for the WISDOM of God, what is gained? The question remains, had the Wisdom or Logos of God any distinct personality? And here it may be fit to notice one thing not yet observed upon, namely, that in the Syriac the term used for Logos is Feminine, and yet the pronoun connected with it is Masculine; "etsi enim, (says the learned Ludov. de Dieu,) [ܐܠܘܡܐ apud Syros sit fœm. hîc tamen masculinè construitur, quia *personaliter* accipitur; nam non dixit ܐܠܐܘܡܐ sed ܐܠܐܘܡܐ nêque ܠܐܠܐܘܡܐ sed ܠܐܠܐܘܡܐ] sic et apud Arabem Verbum ٱلْكَلِمَة, quod per se fœmininum hic tamen construitur masculinè." See much to the same purpose in Dr. Laurence's Sermon on the Logos of St. John, p. 67.—As the Editors conceive the term is only metonymically applied to Christ, Dr. Laurence's note from Schroeder will settle this point also. In Aikin's Annual Register in the re-  
view



I have ventured to suggest a different reading, namely, to substitute the *Angelus Redemptor* or *Angel of the Covenant* for the Logos, not as a necessary matter, but as an illustration by synonymous terms. The reader must judge from the substance of the foregoing remarks, *which* amendment would be most consistent with the sacred writings. I have a high respect for Mr. Lindsey's character and consistency, but I cannot bow down to him as a critic.

From what is intimated in the beginning of St. John's Gospel relative to the divinity and pre-existence of Christ, the Logos or Word of God, I shall proceed to consider what is to be found to the same purpose in the beginning of the epistle to the Hebrews; for as this was certainly written by a Jew, and certainly addressed to Jews, we must reasonably expect to find in

view of Mr. Jones's illustrations of the Gospels, this author is blamed for saying, that the term Logos was borrowed from the Septuagint as exactly expressing the *Word* of God, [or the *Spirit* of God, or the *Wisdom* of God.] It is alleged against Mr. Jones, that חכמה, which is rendered Σοφία 135 times, is not once rendered Λόγος; that of the other 11 words rendered Σοφία, by the LXX, one only is also rendered λογος, and this is only once translated by σοφια, and once by λογος. That on the other hand דבר, which is at least 800 times translated λογος, is never translated σοφια, or any equivalent to it. That of the other 34 words occasionally translated λογος, not one (except the one before-mentioned), has σοφια or any equivalent used as the translation; and that there does not appear to be a single instance in which the word λογος is so used in the New Testament, certainly not in the writings of St. John though he has used it upwards of 60 times. The Reviewer in the Theological Repository before cited, says, he "believes there is no Scriptural authority for supposing the Logos to mean the Wisdom of God, and is certain there is a great deal against it." But whatever the Λόγος stands for either in the LXX, or the New Testament, or elsewhere; the main question is, whether it is to be considered as indicative of an actual subsistence, and real person, upon which see Laurence before cited.

it some confirmation of the foregoing comments, if they are really consistent with the Jewish Scriptures, and Jewish opinions. The first two chapters will be sufficient for our purpose. There then, we are told, with a reference plainly to the records of the Old Testament, that God who revealed himself to the fathers in divers manners and at sundry times in or by the prophets, in the last days spake to the world in or by his Son, whom he constituted heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the shining forth of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High; being so much better than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they, for unto which of the angels, said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee, &c.

I shall not proceed further with the text at present, having in these few verses sufficient to show the connection between the Two Testaments, the object of our preceding remarks; that there is a reference to the Old Testament is evident. It is shown that the same eternal God is the author and giver of all revelations, and that very particularly, the Jewish and Christian dispensations are but different parts of one great scheme of human redemption. Under the former God spake to the fathers of the Hebrew nations, in or through the prophets; under the latter in his Son. It does not say that no communications took place immediately between God and man, but that God spake to the fathers in general through the medium of prophets. To the prophets God spake himself\*, in dreams,

\* The expression generally is the WORD of the LORD came to such and such a prophet.

in visions, or in the refulgence of the Shechinah ; but under the Christian dispensation, the ministry of inspired prophets was laid aside, and God spake to the world in his SON ; who being, says the apostle, (and we must remember he is addressing Hebrews) the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High, being so much better than the angels, &c. It is surely not too much to say, that these terms regularly carry us back to the visible Jehovah of the Old Testament. From our Saviour's own reference to the CXth Psalm, we know that He for whom it was reserved to sit down on the right hand of the Majesty on High was the ADON, or ADONAI JEHOVAH, the Shechinah,  $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha\ \Theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , the angel of the covenant, or of the presence of God ; for all these titles are easily shown to belong to the same person, and *He* the promised Messiah of the Jews. The passage already cited from Malachi is much to the purpose, as evidently and expressly attributing to the Christ, three of these high distinctions—JEHOVAH, ADONAI, and מלאך הברית,  $\delta\ \text{Ἄγγελος της Διαθηκης}$ , or the angel of covenant ; being so much better than the angels, the apostle continues, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. It is surely remarkable, and it is certainly true, that the angel of God's presence far surpassed all other angelic appearances ; in Him alone did God put his *name* ; He alone was called JEHOVAH, He alone spake as JEHOVAH, He alone was worshipped as JEHOVAH. Well therefore may the apostle proceed to appropriate to Him those passages which follow, and which so remarkably establish

establish his Divinity; such as “*thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom;*” “*thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands.*” A passage peculiarly necessary to evince his superiority to angels, because at that time there were divers heretics who ascribed the creation of this visible world to angels and not to Christ. Most of these passages were held by the ancient Jews and by the Chaldee interpreters, to relate to the Messiah, but since our present expositors think otherwise, and that the last passage in particular was spoken of God alone, I shall cite the words of Grotius to show, how little this would alter the case. Speaking of one of the citations from the Psalms, he says, “*at ibi de Deo agitur, hic de Messia. Verum hoc, sed quia pridem receptum erat apud Hebræos, Deum singulari modo in Messia habitatum, et fore, (ut Thalmudici loquuntur) digito monstrabilem, ideo quæcunque de honore Dei dicebantur, eadem applicari solebant ad Messiam.*” A strange thing for Jews to do, if not prepared to acknowledge his full divinity.

That Christ had obtained by *inheritance* a more excellent name than the angels, is a plain proof of his peculiar sonship. And though men should differ for ever as to the nature of this connection, which it has not pleased God to reveal in all its circumstances, yet if it appears to be a fact positively revealed, we may be sure the consent of human philosophers is not necessary to render it credible; upon this relation to the Father depend all those glorious titles and distinctions, upon which we have offered our remarks. The Unitarians apprehend they belong solely to the man  
Jesus



Jesus, in consequence of his ministry, and sufferings in testimony of the truth. But Trinitarians apprehend they belong exclusively to that pre-existent Being, who for our sakes in the last days became man, entered into a close union with our nature, for the express purpose, as the Apostle says, of cleansing us from our sins *δι' αὐτοῦ* by himself, (which as Grotius says, *valde significanter dicitur*, and his explanation is most observable, “non alias Victimam obtulit ut Levitici Sacerdos, sed SEMETIPSUM \*,”) and of rendering us capable of receiving, “the Spirit of Adoption †, that if we suffer with him, we may be glorified together.” Now if there should be any chance of prejudice inclining men to adopt such doctrines as matter of fact, it must be strange that so great an error cannot be effectually set aside by an appeal to Scripture. It must be a prejudice of the most inveterate and infatuated nature that can confound mens understanding so much, as to make them fancy they find in Scripture, what Scripture does expressly

\* Those who turn to Grotius for this reference will find that he says, “abest tamen hoc *δι' αὐτοῦ* à Manuscripto.” The Editors, however, admit it in their Version, Griesbach in his text, and with the greatest reason, it being acknowledged as Whitby has shown against Mill, by all the Greek scholiasts, Theodoret excepted, who however substitutes *αὐτοῦ* with an aspirate, which comes to the same thing; the comment of Grotius is of the more importance because the Editors particularly notice the Primate's rendering, “when he had made a cleansing of our sins by the sacrifice of Himself,” and they observe that the words by *the sacrifice* of are not in the original: this is true, and yet I think the Primate right, at least justifiable; for Whitby has excellently shown, that the term *καθάρσις* must have implied a sacrificial atonement, and Grotius's comment serves to convince us that *δι' αὐτοῦ* would convey the same meaning.

† Romans viii.

con-

contradict: for it is assumed by the Unitarians, that Scripture plainly speaks of our Lord as mere man, the offspring of Joseph and Mary, of one nature only, as being no actual sacrifice for sins, and as a Son only by appointment and adoption, like those he came to save. Of two opinions so diametrically opposite, it seems fair to conclude, that one must indeed be the effect of prejudice, and this is a question which biblical Criticism seems as capable of resolving as any thing; for all must depend on the original terms of Scripture, and the probable sentiments of those who penned the sacred records. Interpreters and translators may bewilder matters greatly; the force of an original term may be greatly weakened by an inadequate rendering, greatly misrepresented by an ill-adapted substitute, or wholly lost by an artful evasion. We have undoubtedly great complaints of this nature to make against the present Editors, for their mode of rendering this particular part of the New Testament; they have not by any means been able totally to obscure the doctrines we espouse, but many suspicious circumstances betray their endeavours to do so; I will do all in my power to represent matters with fairness and equity.

The first passage in which they deviate from the received text is in verse 2. "By whom also he made the worlds:" δι' ἧς καὶ τὰς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν. This, we are told, should be, "for whom also he constituted the ages;" viz. the Antediluvian, Patriarchal, and Mosaic ages or dispensations. I shall not contend with them much about this variation. I firmly believe, the Antediluvian, Patriarchal, and Mosaic dispensations had all a reference to Christ. αἰών is a very questionable word, and though I think it capable of proof, that, as well as its cor-  
respondent

respondent Hebrew term עולם Holam, it may reasonably be held to refer to the visible world or worlds, yet I shall give it up for the present as a matter of indifference. The rendering of the Editors, Doddridge incorporates with his own paraphrase; and we are told that Grotius, Schleusner, and Mr. Lindsey vindicate the rendering of δια with a genitive in the way proposed \*. But should this be ever so justifiable, in the very next chapter it happens to be used both with a genitive and an accusative; and the Editors themselves render it both ways, "For it became him FOR whom, and BY whom are all things;" which being clearly predicated of Christ †, brings us back to the old question concerning the τα παντα; and the grammatical construction of the passage is at the utmost neutral; rather indeed we may assert, that it cannot be turned against those who attribute the creation to the Logos or Christ, but may be turned against them who contend that all things were made or dispensed FOR him, or on his account; but that nothing was really made BY him; which is the case with the Unitarians. Let us however at present return to Αἰων, and let us grant, that δι' & κατὰ τὴν Αἰωνας ἐποίησεν truly signifies ‡, "For, or

\* It should however be noted, that Dr. Whitby has shown against Grotius, that this is contrary to the rule of all grammarians; contrary to the Exposition of all the Greek Fathers; and without example in the New Testament. See also Magee on Atonement, p. 77.

† See also Coloss. i. 15, 16. 1 Cor. viii. 6. 2 Pet. iii. 5.

‡ Should I for argument sake grant this, yet I could not agree to their rendering and interpretation of Ch. xi. 3, a text that might reasonably be expected to puzzle them, and so indeed it seems to have done. Their rendering is, "By faith we understand that the ages were so ordered (καταρτησθαι) by the

or on account of whom, the several ages or dispensations were constituted :” this settles nothing ; we still contend that Christ existed before those ages or dispensations, and we are inclined to cite a witness who ought to be unexceptionable, even Arius himself, who did not scruple to write, that *the Son* existed not only *Ante Secula*, but *Ante Tempora* \* ; that he had a being not only before those ages, which may possibly be alluded to in the term *Αἰώνας*, but before all time, that he was indeed *sine tempore, et ante omnia genitus*, begotten or produced, ere time was known, and literally before all things. After Arius, it will surely be allowed us to cite an Apostolic Father of the Church, whose expressions are too strong to be evaded : in his Epistle to the Magnesians, Ignatius describes Christ, as *προ πάντων μὲν Αἰώνων γεννηθέντα παρὰ τὴν Πατρός, γεννώμενον δὲ ὑπερὸν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου διχα τῆς ὁμιλίας ἀνδρός*, a testimony which may well leave us indifferent as to the exact rendering of *Αἰώνας* as far as it regards our Saviour’s pre-existence. As to his creation of the visible worlds, which the received text plainly expresses, I apprehend that should the original have been otherwise intended, (which I cannot actually grant) yet, the doctrine would remain as strongly asserted in various other parts of Scripture. Nor shall I ever be brought to think, that less than

the Word of God that the present state of things (*τὰ βλεπομένα*) arose not from what did then appear, which is surely embarrassed enough, and absurd enough in point of meaning. See more upon this passage below.

\* Arius’s idea certainly was, that he was *created*, and he even uses the term *creature*, but it has been held, that according to the philosophy of those days, he might be eternal though created, and we are at present only treating of his pre-existence.



this can be intended, by the reference to, and citation from the ciid Psalm, in this very Chapter, ver. 10. And “thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens, are the work of thy hands.” One would think it impossible for any person capable of examining the original, to deny, that the Apostle meant to represent this as spoken by JEHOVAH, of or to the Son. The connective particle *και*, as Whitby admirably observes, must carry us back to ver. 8, its import and design being to knit together those two citations in proof of the Son’s divinity. A case so strong need to be provided against, and therefore in the notes, we are told, that it is a mere reference in proof of the immutability of God, “to show (says Mr. Emlyn, cited by Mr. Lindsey) how able his God who had anointed him, was to make good and maintain what he had granted him, a durable kingdom for ever and ever.” Surely neither Mr. Emlyn, nor Mr. Lindsey could ever have noticed verses 7 and 8, where the discourse evidently turns upon what God said of his Angels, and what, in *contradistinction*, he said of the Son, *προς δε του υιου*, but *to the Son*, God saith; and then follow the three citations, not to prove any such matter at all, as Mr. Emlyn and Mr. Lindsey would have us believe, but expressly to show the super-eminence of the Son of God. The *και* plainly appropriates the latter citation to Christ; and indeed why not, for “it appears from Moses,” to cite the words of a very ingenious writer, “that God (*Elohim*) created the Heavens and the Earth \*; it was God that

\* We shall be reminded, I am aware, that Dr. Geddes has decided that *Elohim* implies no plurality of persons. Let us consider then that Moses in Gen. i. 1, might have used the singular,

that commanded and they were created; by the WORD of JEHOVAH were the Heavens made;" and nobody can doubt, that the Apostles of Christ believed this; and yet St. John tells us, and his words are very remarkable, "In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with GOD, and the WORD was God: all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made:" and by the WORD he means JESUS CHRIST. But how could these things be consistent: unless the Evangelist believed that *Jesus Christ* was the *Elohim*, who appeared all along in the Old Testament under the title of GOD; [Zech. xii. 8. Acts vii. 30, 32.] or the ANGEL of the LORD; by whom God at first created all things; that is, the visible JEHOVAH or WORD of GOD, as he is called by *Philo* and the Jews of that age\*."

The next thing we have to notice is the rendering of verses 4, 5 †. I must confess I should have supposed

singular, as he does Deut. xxxii. 15, 16, and as his object was to resist polytheism, it is surely strange that on the contrary he should select (even) an *ambiguous* term; for how strongly is it applied to the false Gods of the Heathens by the prophet Jeremiah x. 11, "The Gods that have not made the Heavens, and the Earth, THEY shall perish, (plural) &c:"—here the term is *Elohim*, (allowing for the *Chaldee* termination, the verse being in that dialect) and the verbs and pronouns plural, while He must have intended a reference to the *Elohim* of Moses that *did* make the Heavens and Earth, nay in the very verse preceding he calls the true God JEHOVAH ELOHIM.

\* Ben Mordecai's Letters, ii. p. 30.

† At the end of his notes on ver. 3, the *Primate* adds, "What is asserted of the Son thus far in the verse before us is true of him both when he appeared as the *Jehovah-Angel* and when he assumed the character of the Messiah:" and on

supposed no school-boy capable of reading the first Chapter of this Epistle in Greek could have doubted about the purport of it, but must have been certain that it was the design of the Apostle to show the superiority of the Son of God, not only above the Prophets of the Old Testament, but above the Angels of Heaven: and indeed I am convinced that nothing less than a most prejudiced determination against the belief of Angels could have led to a different interpretation of the words of the Apostle. After describing the Son, as the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of his person, and as sitting on the right hand of the Majesty on high, what could possibly connect more naturally with this description, than that he should be shown to be, on this very account, greater than the Angels: and therefore the Apostle introduces it as an inference or explanation of matters, "being so much better than the Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they:" but, though it might be proved

Heb. iii. 3, he observes, "Christ conducted the Mosaic dispensation as the visible representative of God, John i. 18. See also the Postscript to Ben Mordecai's iid Letter, and to show how much this appears to be the opinion of all denominations of believers, as I have not cited *their* testimony before to the fact, I add, from Calvin on Zech. ii. 10, "*Hinc constat, (that is, because this Jehovah was to appear conspicuè et corporaliter;) Sermonem hunc non posse torqueri ad Prophetam; nec posse Deo Patri competere. Christus ergo hic loquitur non ut Homo vel Angelus, sed ut Jehovah; quo nomine hoc loco vocatur et ut Deus Redemptor.*"—And Dr. Sykes on Heb. ii. 2, says, "It seems to be as universally received an opinion, as any among the *Christian* writers; that the *Son of God* was the *Angel of the Covenant*; was the *Angel* that appeared to *Abraham*, and to *Moses*, and to others."

to demonstration, that the Author of this Epistle must have believed in the existence of Angels, and in the ministry of Angels; yet I am not allowed by the Editors of the present Version to suppose, that in the 4th or 5th verse he speaks of Angels at all; Ἀγγελος being as well Greek for a Messenger as for an Angel, and Prophets being Messengers, advantage is taken of this circumstance, to suppress the very name of Angels, and the των αγγελων of verse 4, as well as verse 5, is rendered *those Messengers*, with a reference to the *Prophets* mentioned ver. 1. In every other part of the Chapter also, wherever the term Ἀγγελος occurs, it is rendered Messenger; I was in hope that I should have been permitted to cite against them the last verse, where they are spoken of as λειτουργικα πνευματα, ministering *Spirits*, but not so; in vain do I appeal to either their model Archbishop Newcome, or the original Greek; πνευματα, it seems, is a mere expletive, and therefore as particularly objectionable to the Priestleyan school, must be rejected: Ἀγγελος then is a Messenger, that is a Prophet, and λειτουργικον πνευμα, a Servant, that is a Prophet also; for so it is rendered and explained, ver. 14, still with a reference to the τοις προφηταις of verse 1. Now should this be thought an ingenious correction by Unitarians, it tends to settle nothing. To unsettle things it certainly tends, inasmuch as it is a bold attempt, totally to get rid of some of the most established doctrines of Christianity; but as long as the original is at all accessible, Ἀγγελος may still pass for an *Angel*, and λειτουργικα πνευματα for *ministering Spirits*; if the received text gives offence to those who are now disposed to reject these doctrines, I may confidently affirm it would have  
given



given content to the Author of the Epistle, who being a Jew, *must* have believed in *Angels*, *must* have regarded them as *ministering Spirits*, and *must* have considered them as concerned in the *promulgation of the Law*; and therefore must have felt it highly *necessary* and peculiarly proper, as Doddridge observes, to labour and press the argument *he is here upon*, namely, the superiority of our blessed Lord to all the angelick orders. If any are still inclined to think the opinions of Mr. Lindsey, Mr. Wakefield, Dr. Priestley, &c. are of *more weight* than the opinions of the *Apostle himself*, they must continue to read it *Messengers* and *Servants*, but as long as we have the original by us, I shall never be persuaded that the received text requires correction. The Angels of God, though Angels, may I grant be *Messengers* also; and the *ministering Spirits* who stand before the throne of God in Heaven are undoubtedly his *Servants* and *Vassals*; but this is not the point in question. The only question is,—Does the Apostle mean to speak merely of the prophets in the flesh, from the 1st verse to the 14th of the first Chapter? If he does, he uses three terms for the same thing, Προφηται, Αγγελοι, and Λειτουργικα Πνευματα, which literally rendered, are *Prophets*, *Angels*, and *Ministering Spirits*. But if spoken of one and the same order, they must no longer be rendered literally, but as the present Editors propose, *Prophets*, *Messengers*, and *Servants*. “We must not wonder,” (they tell us in a subsequent note on Ch. ii. 5.) “that the Apostle uses the word Angel in different senses without giving notice of the change. This *incorrectness of style* is not uncommon in the sacred writers.

writers. This Author had before availed himself of the ambiguity of the word Angel, Ch. i. ver. 7. This is an extraordinary mode of reconciling matters: for it is not the Apostle, but the Editors themselves who give these different senses to the term *Angel*, and then censure the sacred writers for an incorrectness of style. I am confident the Apostle uses the term in one and the same sense, even in the 7th verse of Chap. i. to which they refer, but in the rendering of which they actually transpose the words both of the Apostle and the holy Psalmist. There is no incorrectness of style discoverable in the language of the Apostle, in the Chapters under consideration, if the term Angel may but pass for Angel, Prophet for Prophet, and ministering Spirits for ministering Spirits. But there is great incorrectness of style, and a most-faulty obscurity in the language, if as these Editors would have us believe, Angel stands for *Messenger*, and ministering Spirits for *Servants*, and both Messengers and *Servants* for *Prophets*, who were mentioned by their right title at the beginning of the Chapter. I may venture to assert, that not all the present expositors put together, had they lived in those days, would have been able to convince *one* of the *Hebrew* converts to whom the Epistle was addressed, that such was the intention of the sacred writer. They would have persisted in understanding Angels to be meant by each of the terms Ἀγγελοι and λειτουργικά πνεύματα, and Prophets only by the term προφηται. The whole argument of the Chapter being to this effect, that the Son was greater than either the Prophets of old, or the Angels of Heaven; even as to his own *office* and ministration, greater as the *Messiah*, than as the

*Angel*

*Angel of the Jewish Covenant* \* ; and if we are to suppose that St. Paul was the Author of this Epistle, what could be more necessary than that he should dwell much on the distinction between our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Angelic Host, in order to take men off from the worship of Angels, to which both Jews and Gentiles were inclined, and which St. Paul expressly alludes to in his second Chapter to the Colossians. Had indeed the present expositors lived in those days, perhaps they would have had to contend with one whose authority upon another occasion they think great enough to outweigh the evidence and testimony of all existing Manuscripts and Versions of the Scripture. We mean Cerinthus. So far from confounding Angels and Prophets, as these translators do, he held, (as Epiphanius their own referee assures us,) that both “the Law and the Prophets came from the Angels, and that He who gave the Law was one of the

\* Archbishop Tenison says, God *formerly* spake by his Son, as the Logos or Minister; and in the *latter* times by Him as his SON incarnate, begotten by the Holy Ghost, of the substance of the Virgin Mary. The WORD was God’s minister before and under the *Law*; but not in the same *quality* as under the *Gospel*. And he considers it as proper to distinguish between Christ, as God’s *Word* and *Schechinah* under the *former* Covenants, and as *Mediator* and God’s *Son* under the *Gospel*. And for the same opinion he quotes Le Blanc’s Theological Thesis; who owneth Christ as the *Minister* of God of old, but not as *Mediator*; he was *then* the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; but when he came into the world in the character of the Son of Man, he was made both the *Lord* and *Christ*, Acts ii. 36. As the Angel of the Jewish Covenant he administered things through Moses, see Gal. iii. 19, who thereby became the *Mediator* of that Covenant; but of the Christian Covenant, Christ himself was personally the Mediator, (Μεσιτης) as the Apostle calls him, Chap. viii. 6, *χριστος Διαθυνης Μεσιτης*. See Chap. ix. 15. xii. 24.

Angels

Angels that made the world." Epiphanius's words are, Φασκει δε εἶς τον νομον και ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΣ ὑπο ΑΓΓΕΛΩΝ δεδοσθαι, και τον διδωκοῖα νομον ενα ειναι των Αγγελων τον κοσμον πεποιηκοτων, Her. 28. §. 1. And in this particular, Cerinthus was not indeed so wide from the truth, as far as relates to the prevailing opinions of the Jews, for the Law was given by the Angel of God's Presence, and the world was made by the WORD of God, who was the Angel of the Covenant, and who appeared εν δοξα Θεου to the Prophets of old. Had he gone but a step farther, he might have been in agreement with St. John; would he but have acknowledged, that is, that ὁ Λογος σαρξ εγενετο, "the Word was made Flesh," which inconsistently he denied.

And here I have ventured again to render *εγενετο* *was made*, though the present translators assure their readers, that *γινομαι* never bears this sense, and that it is wrongly inserted in many passages of the received text; I am inclined to think it really is so in one passage, and that the very one upon which we have been dwelling so long, viz. Heb. i. 4, which in the received text is rendered, "being made so much better than the Angels, as he hath by inheritance, &c." upon which the learned Wells has the following sensible note, *γινομαι* denotes simply to BE as well as to BE MADE, and in the former as well as latter sense it occurs in the New Testament. Now it being evident from the passages of Scripture cited by the Apostle in the remaining part of this Chapter, that *the name* which Christ is said ver. 4, to *have obtained by inheritance*, does refer to his divine as well as to his human nature; hence *γενομενος* must be rendered *Being*, that being applicable to Christ's divinity as well as humanity, and not *being made*, in which sense it is applicable.



applicable to Christ only in respect of his humanity. Now whether this remark of the learned Commentator be just or not, (I think his reference to the following citations supports him in it,) we might have expected at least to find it countenanced by the present translators who have so repeatedly objected to the received Version of *ἐγενετο*; but for *this correction and improvement*, we unfortunately looked in vain; for alas! they adopt the received reading in this particular passage, and *γενομενος*, it seems, signifies no less than, “having been *made*.” I have already noticed the omission of which the Editors have been guilty in not rightly rendering the term *κεκληρονωμενην* in this verse. They have indeed wholly passed it over. Socinians would have taught them better. Crellius makes much of the heirship of Christ in the following words, and had he but put *à Patre* instead of *à Deo*, it would have been an excellent account of matters. “Christus solus Omnium plane rerum hæreditate gaudet, et summo in omnes, tam *angelos*, quam *homines*, imperio ac dominatu pollet.—Licet autem istis verbis significata sit summa Christi præstantia, ac *Divinitas*, ac veluti cum Deo unitas, tamen simul significata etiam Christia Deo diversitas.” Now this qualification of inheritance should not have been dropt, because we see it is in the opinion even of Socinians one of the main evidences of Christ’s *Divinity*. But if it does not appear in this *improved* Version, it luckily remains in the plainest characters in the Greek original. Grotius would even help us to an improvement of Crellius and the Editors too. “Scandit Oratio,” says he, “Prætulit Christum *Patribus*, *Mosi*, *Prophetis*. Jam et *Angelis* eum præferre volens, per quos Deus Patres, Moscm et Prophetas fuit allocutus

allocutus, ostendit illum Solo Deo *Patre* minorem.” This is a testimony also of no mean authority with the Editors and with Socinians on all points on which they happen to agree; he dwells on the term κληρονομεῖν as of particular importance.

There is a passage in the 3d verse of the first Chap. to the Hebrews, which we have already alluded to in our notes, and which the Editors interpret very differently from other commentators. It relates to the Atonement and not to the Divinity or pre-existence of Christ, the chief subject of our present discussion. The expression δι' εαυτε καθαρισμον ποιησάμενος τῶν αμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. “When he had by himself made a cleansing of our sins.” This is the rendering of the Editors, and we have nothing to object to it, except that they explain it thus: “that cleansing of sin is bringing us out of an unholy into a holy state:” be it so, yet the question remains, how was this done; we say by the precious Cross, and passion of the Lamb slain from the foundations of the world; and that this is intimated both by the terms δι' εαυτε and καθαρισμον ποιησάμενος; which to Jewish ears, if we may trust to the Septuagint, *must have conveyed* the idea of a sacrificial atonement for sin\*. It seems then that in the compass of only four verses, there is a manifest attempt made, to get rid of the following important doctrines, which the received text is supposed to countenance. First, that Christ, as the Logos of God, made the visible worlds. Secondly, that He existed before his birth of Mary, as the Son of the Father in glory and power. Thirdly,

\* See *Whitby* before cited, and *Scott's Christian Life*, Part II. c. 7. p. 383,

that there are any spiritual existences above us, denominated Angels : and fourthly, that Christ was any sacrifice for sins. Here are certainly four very important doctrines brought into a small compass, and it must be hard if there are no means left us of ascertaining the truth. The Editors of this New Version would have us believe that there is no foundation at all for the opinions that have for a long time been current in the world ; opinions espoused, maintained, and propagated by some of the earliest, most celebrated, and most learned Fathers of the Church ; approved by a long succession of Commentators, and Critics, and received as undoubted truths, by numerous sects and denominations of Christians, who differing upon other points, yet agree in deducing these doctrines from the very words of Scripture. Since the Editors, in their few short notes, have peremptorily decided against these and other important doctrines, often asserting that those passages which have been supposed to inculcate them, have hitherto been grossly mistaken, and as grossly misrepresented, I have, through a zeal for the truth, I hope as impartial and as pure as their own, endeavoured to bring back to the notice of all parties some very important facts indelibly recorded in the History of the World, and to re-establish that indissoluble connection between the Old and New Testaments, which I am grieved to say this Improved Version seems particularly calculated, if not expressly intended, to weaken and destroy : my subsequent remarks will be of a more detached nature.

THE professed design of the Improved Version, as stated in the introduction, is to rescue the public from the “ technical phraseology of a systematic theology \* :” this gives a strange air to many of their notes : the general mode of instruction is in the way of affirmation. Pains are generally taken to tell the ignorant what things *are*, as for instance, what a *ransom* is, what a *sacrifice*, what a *propitiation*, what a *sin-offering*, &c. But the style of these Editors is totally different. The whole of their efforts are directed to the discovery and relation of what things are *not*, a ransom is *not* a ransom, nor a sacrifice a sacrifice ; sins are *not* sins, nor bearing of sins bearing of sins, intercession is not intercession, nor propitiation, propitiation. This is puzzling enough to be sure, but I suppose not beyond the capacity of these improvers. If they understand themselves, their capacity must indeed be great, for their system appears to me, I

\* It is curious to see how they act with regard to technical phraseology ; their object is, as they profess, to relieve the public from the evils of it, and yet, there is nothing they more boldly adopt, to prove their own system. Thus in the Apostolic writings, *Sin*, *Sinners*, *Devils*, *Angels*, *Redemption*, and numberless other terms, are not to be understood as at all expressing what is now understood by those words, but merely according to the “ technical phraseology” of *Jews* and *Gnostics*. The real secret however is, that they would have us believe that the technical phraseology of Jews and Gentiles was quite as faulty as that of the particular system they wish to set aside, and that the sacred writers only used it in *accommodation*, that is, not in reality believing a word of either, and yet leaving the world to find this out as they could, for they certainly apply the terms with as little reserve, as though they intended in the strongest manner to fix and confirm their ideas.



must freely confess, so opposite to the real language of Scripture, as to be wholly irreconcilable to it. "A ransom," we are told, (on Matth. xx. 28.) "signifies the *price* paid for the liberty of a slave; and figuratively, any means of deliverance from bondage, so God is said to have redeemed or ransomed the Israelites out of the House of Bondage from the hand of Pharaoh, *not* by paying a price for them, but by the splendid and awful miracles which he wrought for their deliverance; in like manner, the *many*, that is all mankind, being in bondage to the Mosaic ritual, or to heathen superstition, are ransomed by the death of Christ, which is the *means* of their deliverance, *not* as the suffering of a substitute, but as the seal and ratification of a new and better covenant." I have put the note here before the text \*, that I may have the pleasure of surprising the reader the more when I produce it. The plain object of this note is undoubtedly to show that whatever the Scripture tells us of a ransom paid for our redemption, no such thing really happened, our Saviour paid no *price* for us, else undoubtedly there would have been a ransom in the strict definition of the word. His death indeed was a *means* of deliverance, a seal and a ratification of a covenant, but *no ransom*, except *figuratively*, and that not according to the common course of things, but as far as a seal may resemble a price paid, and the fulfilment of an

\* Archbishop Newcome, on the text is among the references. The Archbishop has no note upon it, nor a word in explanation of the term ransom, either here or Mark x. 45. On 1 Cor. vii. 33. "Ye have been bought with a price." He observes it is addressed to those who were *purchased* to God and to Christ, by the *PRICE* of Christ's blood.

agreement, liberty given to a slave. Who would think after all this that in the Scripture there is not a word of a seal, or a covenant, or a figurative ransom, but of a direct literal price paid for the ransom of certain persons ;—" as the son of man came—To *give his Life a Ransom for many.*" Now according to their own definition of a ransom, how can this be taken figuratively. It is used figuratively only where *no* price is paid, but here is a price paid and given for the deliverance of many, so that if *we* may expound things *negatively* as well as *they*, we should say this is *not* to be understood figuratively, it is *not* to be understood as a deliverance without a specific price paid. It is *not* to be understood as a mere seal or ratification of a covenant, but as a proper ransom, namely, the Life of Christ given and paid for the deliverance of sinful men. The *Greek* is certainly literal and plain enough, και δειναι την ψυχην αυτη λυτρον αντι πολλων. Here is the *giving* or *paying* plainly expressed, και δειναι, —the thing given or *price paid*, την ψυχην αυτη \*, the character and intent of the gift, λυτρον a ransom, and the object αντι των πολλων, to procure the deliverance of the many. The death of Christ they allow to have been the *means* of deliverance, and in another place they admit that the death of Christ was voluntary on his part, therefore what can a voluntary surrender of life for a certain purpose be, but a gift of that life, or price paid for the accomplishment of that purpose ; and as for the difference between deliverance and ransom, it consists, it seems, merely in the payment or non payment of a stipulated price ; then the life of Christ was the

\* See Scott's Christian Life, Part ii. Chap. vii. §. §. 3. 4.

*price* of this ransom, according to St. Matthew; and it was of course a proper ransom, in the fullest sense of the word.

To the law and to the testimony, let us believe the Holy Evangelist when he speaks so plainly rather than the Editors of this Improved Version, who to render the Scriptures more intelligible, thus darken and obscure the most perspicuous passages, and positively deny what the sacred writers as positively assert \*.

But they tell us also in their note on Matth. xx. 28, that Christ's death as *Λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, a ransom for many, was NOT the suffering of a substitute. We might suppose from this that such a meaning could not be expressed by the term ransom, since they are so exceedingly careful to do away every impression of that nature; why then let us ask do they so industriously select the very term ransom for the rendering of *ἀνταλλάγμα*, Mark viii. 37, setting aside the received text, and the Primate's rendering "in exchange for;" when they desire it, it seems *ransom* more strongly expresses the substitution of one thing for another than even the

\* I confess it is matter of astonishment to me how so acute a writer as the Author of the Letters of Ben Mordecai could fall into the strange but too common inconsistency of insisting upon the death of Christ being *no price, no ransom*, because we are said to be forgiven *freely* by God, (*δωρεάν*); and yet contending, that Christ received the power of forgiveness as a *reward* for what he *underwent*. For if our forgiveness is unconditionally free, why did Christ undergo any afflictions in order to acquire such power? why suffer at all? why be numbered with transgressors? if this was a *free* gift to sinners, it was plainly no free gift to the innocent Jesus. And yet all was *free*, if the *atonement* as well as the forgiveness wrought out for us, was a voluntary act of God.

terms, “in exchange for;” but when they chuse it *not*, we may none of us venture to give it any such a meaning. I am obliged to speak in this manner of their bold and unjustifiable adulterations of the WORD of GOD! Only a few pages further they again render λυτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, a ransom for many, Mark x. 45. and send us back to their note on Matth. xx. 28, to prove that our Saviour’s life given as a ransom, can in no manner imply the sufferings of a substitute; we do not deny that ἀνταλλάγμα may be rendered “ransom,” or that λύτρον may sometimes express deliverance generally, but we contend, that if our Saviour gave his life as a ransom according to the Evangelist, and died in our stead, ἀντὶ πολλῶν, for, or *instead of*, many, which the Greek expresses\*, both Λύτρον in the original and ransom in the received Version, are to be taken in their literal and proper sense; and the pretended correction of the text is an open falsification of it.”—“Ye were not redeemed,” (or ransomed, ἐλυτρώθητε) says St. Peter, “with corruptible things as silver and gold†,” (the price paid, that is, consisted not in actual money, or things bought with money,) “but with the precious blood of Christ;” *this was* the price paid, *this was* the literal and positive price where-with “ye were BOUGHT;” as another apostle expresses it, 1 Cor. vi. 20. We still are pressed with notes and expositions, to induce us to think of nothing but *seals* and *ratifications*, but we must abide by what is written, and persist in acknow-

\* What the Evangelist expresses by λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, St. Paul terms ἀντὶλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, 1 Tim. ii. 6. Upon which see Outram de Sacrificiis, Lib. ii. c. 6. §. 4. p. 337.

† 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.



ledging a *ransom*, a *price*, and a *purchased* redemption; nor though they should insist ever so upon our doing otherwise, shall we cease to regard the ransom of his blood-shedding, as the suffering of a substitute, while we have the positive testimony both of St. Paul and St. Peter to the fact, that “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, by being made a curse for us,” Gal. iii. 13, that he “suffered for sins, the just for the unjust,” 1 Pet. iii. 18, that “he died for our sins \*,” 1 Cor. xv. 3, “died for the ungodly,” and “was delivered for our offences,” Rom. v. 6. iv. 25.

---

WE ventured to assert of the present Editors, that it would also be found that with them “to bear sins,” is *not* “to bear sins.” Hebrews ix. 28, they render “so Christ also was offered once to

\* “Died for our sins,” 1 Cor. xv. 3, *υπερ των αμαρτιων ημων*. We are bidden to take notice that “the true reading of” Gal. i. 4, is *περι των α. η.* and not *υπερ*: that the expression is very general, q. d. in relation to our sins. Of course *υπερ*, if it differs materially from *περι*, must be allowed its full force in the passage cited above from the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Whitby considers them as equivalent. See his Examen Var. Lect. Millii, and in his notes on Romans viii. 3, shows that *περι αμαρτίας*, according to the language of the Old Testament, signifies a sin-offering. See also Magee, p. 149, and his 30th note in p. 153, in which the Arguments which the Socinians draw from the Scripture use of the prepositions *αλη*, *υπερ*, *δια*, and *περι* are briefly but very sufficiently answered. See also Outram de Sacrificiis, Lib. ii. cap. vi. §. ii. p. 345.

*bear*

*bear away* the sins of many ;” which in the note they tell us, (from *Newcome*,) is to cause the forgiveness of them. This we do not deny. If he caused the forgiveness of them we should think he was instrumental in rendering God propitious, and appeasing his just anger ; but there is a great difference between “ *bearing*” and “ *bearing away*,” the sins of many. The generality of the world would scarcely suspect how much is hidden from their view by this small addition to the words of the apostle. *Bearing away* our sins *may be* a *figurative* mode of expressing the *pardon* and *forgiveness* of them, but *bearing* them, points immediately to the nature and cause of Christ’s *suffering*. If his death merely took place in ratification of his promises ; promises, that is, of forgiveness to all who would repent and be converted, he might be said to bear away the sins of those who entered into the covenant, by a figure of speech not inapplicable certainly, but yet not very appropriate : but if he also *suffered* as a *vicarious atonement*, and the scriptures tell us he *bore* our sins, the sense of this expression is singular and peculiar, and cannot be mistaken ; it is not a figure of speech, but an exact and literal representation of a matter of fact ; it must not be altered or expunged therefore upon light grounds. There is another passage where the term bearing of sins is applied to our Saviour, viz. 1 Pet. ii. 24. Thus rendered in this Version ; “ who himself bare our sins in his own body on the Cross,” which we are also told in a note, signifies, “ he removed them and carried them away ; so Christ is said Matt. viii. 17, to *bear our sicknesses*.” This reference to St. Matthew may help us to a right understanding of the case, for St. Matthew himself happens to

cite Isaiah, chap. LIII \*. To this writer then we must have recourse at last to determine the sense of "bearing of sins:" thus then does *he* describe the sufferings of the Messiah.

4. Surely our infirmities he hath borne:  
And our sorrows he hath carried them.  
Yet we thought him judicially stricken,  
Smitten of God, and afflicted.
5. But he was wounded for our transgressions;  
Was smitten for our iniquities:  
The chastisement by which our peace was  
effected was laid on him;  
And by his bruises we are healed.
6. We all of us like sheep have strayed:  
We have turned aside, every one to his own  
way;  
And Jehovah hath made to light upon him  
the iniquity of us all.
7. It was exacted, and he was made answerable,  
And he opened not his mouth.
8. By an oppressive judgment he was taken off;  
For the transgression of my people he was  
smitten to death.
9. Although he had done no wrong,  
Neither was there any guile in his mouth.
10. Yet it pleased Jehovah to crush him with  
affliction.  
If his soul shall make a propitiatory sacrifice,  
He shall see a seed, &c.

\* The Evangelist's reference is *supposed* to be to the 4th ver. of Isaiah, chap. LIII. That this makes no difference, may be seen elsewhere. See our references below; and Outram de Sacrificiis, Lib. ii. c. 5.

11. By the knowledge of him shall my servant  
justify many ;  
For the punishment of their iniquities he shall  
bear.
12. Therefore will I distribute to him the many  
for his portion,  
And the mighty people shall he share for his  
spoil,  
Because he poured out his soul unto death ;  
And was numbered with the transgressors ;  
And he BARE the SINS of many ;  
And made intercession for the transgressors.
- 

To bear the sins of any, is allowed to be equivalent to the bearing the punishment or consequences of sin, and this even by those who are particularly adverse to the doctrine of a proper atonement, as *Sykes, Crellius, Socinus, &c.* But this contributes little to the settlement of the question, because though they admit it in the case of a man's own sin, they deny it where the sin of another is concerned, and besides the forgiveness of sins, *may* also be *figuratively* described as the bearing away the *punishment* thereof; in short by this last mode of interpretation it is impossible to fix upon any terms that may not be explained away, but it requires an extraordinary boldness to convert a term that may be understood literally into a figurative expression, for the mere sake of getting rid of a doctrine, too plainly expressed to be misunderstood, were the words left unchanged. "To bear the punishment of another's iniquities," is capable of being plainly and literally expressed, and in fact is so in the prophecy of Isaiah. "To bear the  
sins



sins of many," when understood, as it should be, of the *punishment* or *consequences* of sin, is as plain an expression as the former, and equally capable of being understood literally : but to *bear away* the sins of many is very different, and must be understood figuratively, while " to bear them away in his own body on the cross," seems to be too extravagant an expression to be adopted even by Unitarians themselves, so that here the present translators suffer the received text to stand good, though they explain it away in their notes. The simplest method to be taken in adjusting this difference is certainly to ascertain, if possible, how far the literal sense of " bearing sins," that is, " the punishment of sin," is to be considered as the original sense of the sacred writer, or whether we are *compelled* to understand the expression only in the figurative sense of " bearing sins away," as the bodily diseases of men were *borne away*, by our Saviour in his miraculous cures. We say *compelled* to understand it, because the present Editors imply as much in all cases where their sentiments happen to differ from those of the generality of mankind. One short note is introduced to tell the unlearned, (for the learned cannot be so imposed upon) that whatever any given passage may have heretofore been held to inculcate, *it does not really inculcate any such thing*. It would be great waste of time to go over ground that has been so recently pre-occupied by others, and where all seems to have been done that we could wish or desire, towards the settlement of this particular question. Professor Magee\*, of Dublin, has

\* See his Sermons on Atonement, printed in 1801:

taken such particular pains in elucidating this point of criticism, and in replying to all the most laboured objections of the Unitarian and Socinian writers, that we shall think it quite sufficient to give the result of his curious researches. He has very particularly examined the two terms employed by Isaiah נשא and סבל, as well as the term used by the LXX, and the Apostles (*αναφέρω*), and has fully proved, in our estimation at least, that the literal sense of “bearing the punishment of others sins,” must have been intended by the sacred writers\*. One conclusion he is brought to, is, that “the word נשא, when connected with the word SINS, is throughout the entire of the Bible to be understood in one of these two significations: BEARING, i. e. sustaining on the one hand, and FORGIVING on the other. And that, in neither of these applications, does there seem any reason for interpreting it in the sense of BEARING AWAY; nor has any one unequivocal instance of its use, in that sense, ever been adduced.”

The meaning of the word סבל, is still more evident; where *not* connected with the word SINS, it has uniformly the sense of bearing a burden; and

\* The learned Ludovic de Dieu, in his Commentaries on the four Gospels has the following excellent note on John 1. 29. *Ἰδὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸ Θεὸς ὁ ἄγων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.* Est *αἰρεῖν ἁμαρτίαν* peccatum in se suscipere et portare, sicut Matth. xvi. *ἀρᾶτω τὸν σάκκον αὐτοῦ.* Christus, quā Deus, *αἰρεῖ* aufert peccatum remittendo. Sed quā Agnus Dei et Victimā piacularis, de quā hic procul dubio agitur, *αἰρεῖ* portat peccatum, portando expiat, expiando aufert, efficitque ut remittatur, est ergo hic *αἰρεῖν* tum נשא, tum סבל Esa. LIII. ubi quoque שׂה, *Agnus* vocatur, et dicitur Correctio pacis nostræ fuisse עליו *super ipsum*, et Deus בן דמניע, *injecit in eum* peccata omnium nostrum.

in one of the only two passages where it occurs connected with SINS, its meaning is too palpable to be misunderstood, viz. Lament. v. 7. "Our fathers have sinned, and are not, and we have borne their iniquities," or as Dr. Blayney renders it, we have *undergone the punishment of their iniquities*. Primate Newcome, the model of these translators, particularly renders the Proverb alluded to by Jeremiah and Ezekiel; "the fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the childrens teeth are set on edge," in this manner from the Chaldee, "the fathers have sinned, and the sons are smitten." If the words used by the prophet to express the "*bearing the sins of many*," and "*the bearing the punishment of mens' iniquities*," may with greater reason and propriety, and more consistently with the general use of the terms in Scripture, be understood to signify the bearing the punishment due to them, than the mere removal of them in the way of pardon and forgiveness, we may reasonably turn to the other parts of the prophecy as well as to its accomplishment, to see if they co-incide most with the former or the latter interpretation. Now in explanation of these very terms, we are told, that "God *made the iniquities of us all to fall upon him*," who is said to have "*borne the iniquities of many* \*;" he was "*numbered with the transgressors*;" "*wounded for our transgressions*, and *smitten for our ini-*

\* How far these expressions may be understood, as bearing a reference to the Scape Goat, the Professor also considers at length, showing how little advantage is to be gained by Unitarians, by insisting so much as they do on this particular ceremony; which, when duly examined, does not in any manner contradict the doctrine of vicarious suffering, and a strict propitiatory Atonement.

*quities;*"

quities;" "for our peace appears to have been effected by his chastisement, and we healed by his bruises;" he came to "give his life a ransom for many;" he was "offered to bear our sins." "He who knew no sin was made a sin (or sin-offering) for us." He "redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us;" He "suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust." He was "delivered for our offences," "died for our sins," "gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God;" "His blood was shed for many for the remission of sins;" And "we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son." Surely any person who could be brought without prejudice to look upon these passages, would be naturally led to think that Christ "bore the punishment of our iniquities," in some manner as a substitute; not by a mere figurative removal of them, but by an actual endurance of the penal consequences of sin, in his own body on the cross. The learned author, whose labours we have thus attempted to abridge, examines as well the Greek terms used by the LXX, as the original Hebrew terms of the prophet himself, and it is sufficient to state that the conclusion he draws, from a careful investigation of the matter, are as strongly in favour of a proper atonement, as the circumstances we have already touched upon\*. It is impossible to go into detail at present; a reference to the Professor's own book must be the utmost we can attempt †, and we can only conclude with declaring it

\* See Parkhurst's Greek and Hebrew Lexicons also, under the words *αναφρω*, *נשא* and *סבל*; and Leigh's *Critica Sacra*, under *αναφρω*.

† Since the first writing of these Remarks, and the former reference to Dr. Magee's book, a new Edition of that valuable work has appeared in 2 vols. 8vo. Printed at Dublin, 1809, for Cadell and Davies, &c.



to be our firm persuasion, that in positive contradiction to the confident assertions of these Editors, when Christ is represented as suffering for sin, we are bound to understand, that it *was* by *bearing the punishment due to sin*. A few remarks from Dr. Outram's celebrated work de *Sacrificiis* should be added; upon the 12th verse of Isaiah, "*Fortium dividit spolia, pro eo quod tradidit in mortem animam suam, et cum sceleratis reputatus est, et ipse multorum peccata tulit;*" he observes, "*ubi Verbis iis, ipse multorum peccata tulit, ea tribuenda est sententia, quæ cum personâ ejus convenerit, qui cum sceleratis reputatus, hoc est, ut nocens tractatus erat. Jam verò quando talis quisquam, qualis quidem tanquam nocens tractatur, peccata ferre dictus est, quis verba illa peccata ferre, aliud quid, ac pœnas luere valere judicet? Nullæ enim res inter se magis convenire possunt quam pœnas luere, et tanquam hominem nocentem tractari. Quæ omnis convenientia tollitur, si peccata ferre in modo posito vatis dicto nihil aliud esse, nisi ea auferre ac delere, cum Socini sectatoribus dixeris.*" Nothing can be fairer reasoning than this; and it is what we have continually insisted on: why was he numbered with the transgressors, in so marked and extraordinary a manner, if his death was only requisite, to verify his promises, or ratify God's covenant? And let us remember, that he was not merely, and as if by accident a victim of Jewish spite and cruelty, but the Spirit of God foretold it. *He* who said he should "*bear our sins,*" said also he should be "*numbered with transgressors;*" and he who said he should be "*numbered with the transgressors,*" declared that "*he should bear the punishment of other mēns' iniquities.*" Should all this  
appear

appear a mere figure of speech to the Socinians and Unitarians, yet was it *literally* fulfilled by God Almighty, beyond all doubt and disputation. He “ bore the punishment of sin \* in his own body on the cross,” and the very historian who thus records this undoubted fact in the history of our Saviour, declares also, that it was for no sins of his own, but that he suffered “ *the just for the unjust*,” δικαιος ὑπερ ἀδικων. Dr. Outram insists also on the several versions of Isaiah liii. 6, as tending entirely to confirm the sense conveyed by the received text, and to set aside the Socinian glosses on it, “ Quid enim hic interpretes Græci? Κυριος παρεδωκεν αὐτον ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν. Quid versio Vulgata? *Posuit Deus in eo iniquitatem omnium nostrum.* Quid Arabica? *Dominus autem tradidit eum peccatis nostris.* Quid Syriaca? *Dominus fecit, ut occurrerent in eum Peccata nostra.* Quid interlinearis? *Dominus fecit occurrere in eum iniquitatem omnium nostrum.*” Quid Castellio? *Jova in eum omnium nostram crimen Conjecit.* Quæ omnes ejusmodi sunt versiones, ut Christum sic, ut onere quodam, peccatis nostris gravatum fuisse, pœnâque vicariâ affectum doceant.”

Besides trying to get rid of the word “ *Bearing*” in itself, an attempt is made throughout this Version to dispose also of the word “ *Sins*,” so that I may fairly add that with the Editors, *sins* are *not sins*. The Authors already cited may give full satisfaction also upon these heads; Outram in his replies

\* The present translators positively contradict this: but to use an expression of Dr. Priestley, “ this should not prevent our judging for ourselves,” it is admitted by many opponents of the doctrine of the Atonement.

to Episcopius, and Magee in his animadversions on the contributors to the Theological Repository. The design of the present Editors is as much as possible to confine the meaning of the term sin, to outward uncleanness, the disqualifications of an uncovenanted state, or what are commonly called "Sins of Ignorance," to the exclusion of all moral evil or moral guilt. This is done to so great a degree as to call forth the animadversions of a very learned writer of their own party\*; the attempt has often been made before, and as often resisted. Outram de Sacrificiis, lib. i. c. xiii §. 4, may be consulted as to the disputes of former days, and Magee in his 37th note, Sermon 1†, on the more recent objections of our own contemporaries. See also Whitby, or Heb. ix. 7.

---

I OBSERVED, that *intercession* also with the Editors, was *not* intercession. To prove this, I need but give the word they substitute for intercession in the received text, Heb. vii. 25. viz. *interposition*. This they are willing to grant is fully implied by the word *εντροπυχανω*. But this interposition may be any thing *but* intercession. "It *may perhaps* mean," they say, "that Christ in his ex-

\* See the Review in the Monthly Repository for July last, before cited.

† Vol. i. p. 308, New Edition.

alted state *is* exerting his power in some *unknown way* for the benefit of his Church," and Mr. Lindsey supplies us with another conjecture about it, (supposing it *must* be intercession,) "the perpetual intercession of Christ may perhaps be, the continual operation and effect of his miracles and doctrines in the world, by which men are brought to believe in God by Him, and to be saved." Now, I cannot help saying, that this seems to me no more to resemble a proper intercession (God being the object) than a seal resembles a ransom. But why all these objections to the term intercession? The Editors themselves inform us, they are desirous we should not apprehend that this text, viz. Heb. vii. 25, "gives any countenance to the custom of offering prayers to God through the intercession of Christ."

Now St. John tells us, that "if any man sin, we have an *advocate* with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins," 1 John ii. The manner in which our Saviour exerts his power for sinners in his exalted state, does certainly not appear to have been so much unknown to the Apostle, as to the Editors of the Improved Version. An advocate implies intercession, but an advocate, when it occurs in Scripture, is *not* an advocate it seems; παρακλητος is a word, we are told, of very general import. "It may only mean, that Christ is the *medium of reconciliation*." This expression, *medium of reconciliation*, serves them upon all occasions; if Christ is spoken of distinctly as a *ransom*, a *sacrifice*, a *propitiation*, an *intercessor*, or an *advocate*, we are triumphantly told, he is not either of these as such, but merely as "a *medium of reconciliation*." This is curious indeed; we say he is the medium of recon-



conciliation, as our *ransom, atonement, propitiation, intercessor*, &c. : and *they* reply that he is not any of these things, though the Scriptures tell us so, but “*a medium of reconciliation.*”

But however, (to return to where we were) St. John describes our Lord to be “*our advocate with the Father;*” let us now then adopt what the Unitarians would substitute for intercession, and see how the passage would stand. “*If any man sin, we have, with the Father, προς τον πατερα,*” *the continual operation of Christ's miracles and doctrines in the world, by which men are brought to believe in God by him and be saved.* This would be as nearly as possible nonsense, and therefore I will not dwell on it; let us try the other. “*If any man sin, we have with the Father, Christ in his exalted state exerting his powers in some unknown way for the benefit of his Church\*.*” Now this would be admirable sense, but it in no manner excludes intercession, and we have quite as great a right to believe it on the assertion of an Apostle, as to reject it upon the unsupported suggestions of the Editors.

Take παρακλητος in its *other* senses, it would not so well apply; “*if any man sin, we have a comforter, a guide, an instructor, with the Father;*” an advocate is the very friend we stand in need of *with the Father*, and since the Editors admit his *interposition above*, we must incline to think it cannot well be in any manner but as our advocate and intercessor: that is, without going minutely into particulars, the *analogy* is sound and good. As a very sensible writer observes, “*the interposition*

\* “*Christ liveth to intercede for us.*” Newcome, Rom. v. 10.

of Christ, if not literally and properly intercession, is nevertheless *analogous* to it; for what a proper intercessor is, between one man and another, that *Christ* is between *God* and *man*." He is not *figuratively* but *analogously* so called, which comes much more near to an actual reality than a mere figurative expression, as is admirably shown in *Veysie's* VIth *Bampton Lecture*.

The odd thing is that they scruple not to allow that *παρκλητος* clearly signifies *advocate* when predicated of the Holy Spirit, though according to their ideas of things, this ought at least to justify our prayers to that divine Being. Their great object is to deprive *our Saviour* of all right to this act of *worship*; I do not deny that the Holy Spirit is in some sense our advocate, but that he is so in a different manner from *Christ*, may be seen by consulting the following learned authors; *Beza* on John xiv. 16; *Ludov. de Dieu* on the same passage; *Pearson* on the Creed, fol. 328; and *Outram de Sacrificiis*, c. vii. l. 2, where also is much to the purpose on the term *ἐντρογχανω*, which the Editors dwell upon. See also the Appendix to *Magee's Sermons* on Atonement, second Edition; which every person should consult who would desire to know what Unitarianism really is, as described by its great friend and patron Mr. *Belsham*.

To conclude, as to the countenance given by the text Heb. vii. 25, to the custom of *offering prayers to God through the intercession of Christ*, I shall observe, that we had better not lay it aside upon such weak authority, since at all events the text positively declares, as the Editors themselves render, that "Christ is able to save in the fullest degree those who come to God by Him, since he ever liveth to *interpose* for them." If he is able  
to

to save to the utmost by his *interposition* with God, and has expressly told us, that “if we ask any thing in *his name* HE will do it,” we had better trust his word, and continue to “ask in *his name*,” than puzzle our brains, and endanger our salvation by listening to what I must call, the sophistry, of these new improvers of Christianity. In Rom. viii. 34, they admit the term *intercede* into their text, but explain it away, exactly in the same manner in their note on the place \*.

---

THERE are two very particular passages which the Editors undertake to assure the public, give no countenance to the commonly received doctrine of Atonement by vicarious sufferings, and they allege that the world has been misled by the common translation; the first is Romans iii. 25, 26, and the other 2 Cor. v. 21. If we are to be accounted among those who have been misled into such strange notions by the common translation, we must declare we are also incapable of being set right (as the Editors would call it) by their own

• I cannot help adding a note from *Philo*, of which I am reminded by an *Unitarian*, Mr. Jones, who is disposed to think *Philo*, a Christian: αναγκαιον γαρ ην τον ιερωμενον τω τε κοσμη πατρι, παρακλητω χρησθαι τελειωτατω την αρετην υιω, προς την αμνησιαν εμαρτηματων και χορηγιαν αφθονω τατων αγαθων, which he renders, “It becomes him who is devoted to the *Father* of the world, to employ as his *intercessor* his own *Son*, who is most perfect in virtue, in order that he may obtain the forgiveness of his sins, and the supply of every good.” Jones’s *Illustrations of the Gospels*, p. 300.

rendering

rendering of the passages ; the first they translate thus,—“ Whom God has set forth as a mercy-seat in his own blood, to show his [Method of] justification concerning the remission of past sins, through the forbearance of God ; to show I [say] his [Method of] justification at this present time ; that he might be just, and the justifier of him who hath faith in Jesus.” We must now transcribe the note upon it, first however observing, that they follow Locke in rejecting the common reading, “ through faith in his blood,” (which *Newcome* adopts,) and this, because the words *δια πίστεως* are omitted in the Alexandrian and some other MSS., and “ because they obscure the sense.” Their explanation or paraphrase of the passage, then, is as follows:—“ the Apostle represents Christ as a Mercy-Seat, consecrated by his own blood, upon which the goodness of God, as it were, takes its stand, and declares his gracious purposes and dispensations to mankind ; see Locke and Taylor’s *judicious* note upon the text. The word *ἱλαστήριον* never signifies “ propitiation,” as it is translated in the public version \*, but is always used, wherever it occurs, both in the Old Testament and the New, to express the Mercy Seat which was the golden lid of the ark, upon which the Shechinah or cloud of glory rested, and from which oracles were dis-

\* Some authors, however, have supposed *ἱλαστήριον* to be an adjective, and that *θυμὰ* or *ἱερεῖον* is to be understood as a substantive. See Magee’s Sermons on Atonement, note 26, Sermon 1, and the references there, particularly *Archbishop Newcome’s* translation. I shall add another authority ; see Dr. Priestley’s notes on all the Books of Scripture ; the Dr. admits that “ thus it may signify a propitiatory sacrifice, under which *idea*, the death of Jesus is *represented* in the Epistle to the Hebrews.”



pensed, Exod. xxv. 22, Numb. vii. 8, 9. Lev. xvii. 2. Heb. ix. 5. It must be evident to every unprejudiced person, that this beautiful allusion of the Apostle, which is intended to represent Christ as the *messenger* of divine mercy, and the *medium* of divine *communications* to mankind, gives no countenance to the commonly received doctrine of vicarious sufferings, though many lay great stress upon this text, misled by the common translation." To shorten matters, I am always willing to grant every thing that can be granted; let then *Ιλασηριον* be the mercy-seat or propitiatory, and not the propitiation itself as rendered in the received text; and let all the references be admitted as proving what they are brought to prove, still there remains much to be observed upon; and first, though the *Ιλασηριον* or mercy-seat, was the golden lid of the ark, upon which the Shechinah rested, and from which oracles were dispensed, yet the mention of the blood of Christ in this text, points clearly to another circumstance relating to the Jewish mercy-seat\*, namely, that it was at or before the mercy-seat, that the High Priest sprinkled the blood of the Sin-offering, to make atonement for those who desired God to be propitious to them. Whoever will be at the pains to read the xvith Chapter of Leviticus, must surely be led to think that if the term *Ιλασηριον*, should point to the mercy-seat, and ought not to be confounded with the *Ιλασμος* or Propitiation, yet the *blood* must have a reference to the blood of the Sin-offering, sprinkled before the mercy-seat by the High Priest, to make atonement, not merely for the mercy-seat itself, but for

\* "Sanguinis autem nomen ad veterum sacrificiorum figuram nos revocat, quorum veritas in ipso Christo fuit." Beza.

the Sins of the people \*. I am not conscious that I have written a word, that is not warranted by the language of the xvth Chap. of Leviticus. The term for making Atonement in the LXX has a relation to *ἱλαστηριον*. The expression is *ἐξίλασθαι*. The Atonement itself, therefore, would be *ἐξίλασμος* or *ἱλασμος*, which is equivalent. Now we know that St. John twice speaks of our Saviour as the *ἱλασμος* or Propitiation; *ἱλασμος περὶ τῶν Ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*, the Propitiation for our sins, 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10; and if this is not to be considered as strikingly analogous to the expressions in Leviticus, *ἐξίλασται περὶ αμαρτίας—ἐξίλασκεσθαι περὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ—ἀπο πάσων τῶν αμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*—I know not what could be considered as such. Let us then take their own rendering, “whom God has set forth as a mercy seat in his own blood.” Does this convey no other idea than that the Apostle meant to represent Christ as a “mercy seat consecrated by his own blood, on which the goodness of God might take its stand to declare his gracious purposes and dispensations to mankind?” May it not convey as well the idea of a propitiation as a propitiatory †? When

\* Mr. Locke, whom the Editors cite for other parts of their exposition, notices that the atonement under the law was made by blood sprinkled on the propitiatory, or mercy-seat, referring to Levit. xvi. He draws, however, the same conclusion from the passage that the Editors do, and is certainly very far from admitting our sense of it. As Dr. Doddridge has noticed his remarks, I need not stop to do it, but must declare, that after an attentive consideration of his argument, and exposition, I see not the smallest reason for altering my opinion of the text.

† The correspondence which I have pointed out between the *ἱλασμος* and *ἱλαστηριον* takes place in the Hebrew. The verb *כפר*, which signifies to cover, and from whence the mercy-seat

When St. John as fully assures us, Christ was our propitiation, as St. Paul tells us he was our mercy seat; and the Apostle to the Hebrews speaks of our "having boldness to enter into the holiest," (that is, to the mercy seat,) "*by the blood of Jesus,*" x. 19. The "*blood of sprinkling,*" as he calls it, Chap. xii. 24. and "*his own blood where-with he sanctifies his people,*" Ch. xiii. 12. Surely the connection intimated by St. Paul between the *Ιλασηριον*, and the blood of Jesus, (our *Ιλασμος*,) must convey to us some other notions of the mercy seat, than *merely* that of its being the resting place of the Shechinah, or the place for the dispensation of oracles, though in both these senses *also* very applicable certainly to the Mediator of the New Covenant, who was himself that Shechinah, as well as the dispenser of the Divine Oracles. The words *δια πιστεως* do not at all obscure the sense to us, but are perfectly intelligible whether we refer them to Christ as our *Ιλασμος* or propitiation, or to Him as the *Ιλασηριον* or mercy seat of God. In either case we look to him for the rendering of God propitious to us, which was the object of the Jews in resorting to the mercy seat of old, there to present their sin-offering for an atonement\*. I am aware that I offend Unitarians, when I talk of God's being ren-

or golden cover of the Ark had its name, being applied to the covering of transgressions, that is, to the sheltering the sinner from punishment and suffering; in short, it truly signifies to *atone*, *expiate*, and *propitiate*, (as even *Sykes* admits,) if the Unitarians would but acknowledge that those terms have any distinct meaning.

\* "*Dici potest etiam Christus 'Ιλατης, id est, Propitiator.*" Beza.

Grotius also observes of our Saviour, in hac nostra (nempe lege) Christus ipse non sacerdos tantum sed est Victima.

dered

dered propitious to Man \*, but I know not how to express myself otherwise with any decency. I cannot see what need there could be of any mercy seat or sin-offering or atonement, to bring the unholy into an holy state, or the uncovenanted into a covenanted relation; if God must in the nature of things, be as propitious to the one as the other; to reconcile God to man may appear to Unitarians to be an absurdity, but if man needs to be reconciled to God in order to obtain his blessings, surely this implies a previous estrangement on the part of *both* †; see Vesic, 28, 29. Serm. 1.—Pear-

\* So very desirous are they of doing away all ideas of God being propitiated, that they bid the reader take notice that the Apostle (Heb. ii. 19.) does not speak of our Saviour's propitiating God, but of his propitiating the sins of his people; *ἱλασκεσθαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας*. This, they say, is a remarkable expression, and so indeed it is according to their interpretation, for to propitiate sins is as near as can be nonsense: but if they would look into Porphyry de Abstinentiâ, they would find, that in Greek, to propitiate sins is to propitiate *τὸ Θεῖον* the Deity. See Whitby in loco.

† It would surely puzzle any plain understanding to conceive, how these Editors can fancy, that nothing was required, nothing done to reconcile *God to man*, when after assuring us, Rom. iv. 25, that Christ being "delivered for our offences," does *not* at all mean that he bore the punishment of them to appease the anger of God, they yet proceed, Ch. v. 1, to adopt the Apostle's language, of our having *peace* with God through Jesus Christ, and ver. 9. of our being saved from anger through Him.

But nothing surprises me more than their note on 1 John ii. 2, a passage I have had particular occasion to refer to. "And he is the *propitiation* for our sins, &c." Their note is, "*ἱλασμός* the act of *pacifying* an *offended* party: *Schleusner*. Christ is a propitiation as by his Gospel he brings sinners to repentance, and thus *averts* the *divine displeasure*."—So that after all it would seem God is the offended party, whom it is necessary to conciliate: but yet in their note on Ch. iv. 10, they again explain this away.

son,



son, 364, 365. And this will lead us to the remainder of the text,—“To shew, (says this improved Version,) the method of his justification, concerning the remission of past sins, through the forbearance of God.” The Greek is εἰς ἐνδείξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν παρῆσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων, ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Now I disapprove of the rendering τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, his justification or method of justification, instead of his *Righteousness*, as the received text has it. I think the common Version is better, though that indeed, as commonly understood, does not come up in all respects to my idea of the matter. In these two verses we have δικαιοσύνης twice, δικαίον once, and δικαιοῦντα—*just* and *justification* and *justify* sound alike, but are not strictly so; *just*, and *righteousness*, and *justify* are neither quite alike in meaning, nor sound alike; *just*, and *justice*, and *justify* would perhaps come nearest both in sound and meaning, and in correspondence to the Greek \*. Suppose then we were to read it, “to show, or make manifest his justice concerning the remission of past sins through the forbearance of God. To manifest, I say at this time, his *justice*, that he might be *just*, and the *justifier* of him that hath faith in Jesus.” Past sins

\* And thus the Vulgate and Beza; ad demonstrationem *Justitiæ* suæ ut sit *Justus*, et *Justificans* eum, &c. “*Justitiæ* autem Nomine, (Beza observes,) intelligitur summa illa Dei, tum in vindicandis peccatis severitas, Justissimæ ipsius Naturæ conveniens; tum summa ipsius et in præstandis promissis fides, et in Christi *Justitia* credentibus impetrata misericordia, sic videlicet in suos sese simul, et Justissimum, et clementissimum, in suos præbendo.” This note of Beza and the following are so entirely consistent with all that I have ventured to suggest, that I hope the learned reader will not fail to examine them.

remitted through the forbearance of God, without any implied atonement, might have brought his *justice* in question. This then required to be vindicated and manifested to the world in its proper light; How was this to be done? the text tells us, by setting forth Christ as his *mercy seat* by his blood. The legal atonements made before the mercy seat under the Old Covenant were supposed to render those for whom they were made holy and clean, and to bring them into a state of reconciliation with God, so that God could bless them and be merciful to them, and that without imputation of his justice, inasmuch as by their sin-offering they made acknowledgment of their uncleanness, and of their subjection, and the atonement, such as it was, was suffered to stand in the place of compensation. Now all parties I believe are agreed, (though the Socinians and Unitarians carry matters in this respect much *too far*;) that the offerings and atonements under the Old Covenant by no means extended to the expiation of all sorts of sins, or rather to the removal of the guilt of them: and yet there was some remission procured by them. Whatever in the mean time was not fully and adequately provided for, must be supposed to have required by analogy, some greater and more precious atonement. If atonement in small matters was necessary, it must, à fortiori, be still more requisite, one should think, in greater concerns. Since the Editors choose to refer to the Old Testament, for which, however, I do not conceive they have much respect\*, but since they do, I must have leave

\* Dr. Priestley chose to declare, that the whole of the Old Testament is throughout a most unaccountable book, but I may

leave to argue with them, that if atonement was necessary, even for sins of ignorance as they call them, and I may add for infirmities and accidents that were natural and unavoidable, how much more necessary must it be to remove the contaminations of moral guilt, and the impurities of sin and wickedness. Now I maintain that the blood of Christ was the great atonement that extended to all these necessities, supplied all the deficiencies of the *legal* offerings, *justifying* the former forbearance of God, by connecting the remission of past sins under the Old Covenant, with the remission of sins through Christ under the New; in this consisted the great display of God's *justice* and *mercy combined*, which the term "Righteousness," when properly understood, admirably expresses\*; when the *justice* of God, that is, is fairly *taken into account*, the great object and concern of all offerings and atonements. Christ was set forth as a mercy seat in his blood, being the express antitype and substance of both; the Propitiatory and the Propitiation; to manifest God's *justice*,

may as boldly assert, that when separated from the Old Testament, the New Testament is still more unaccountable; both are sufficiently intelligible, when applied to illustrate each other.

\* It is a remarkable circumstance, but as far as my experience extends, invariably true, that whenever Socinian and Unitarian writers cite that memorable passage in Exodus xxxiv. 6, 7, they cite the former part only, and omit the latter clause; that is, they triumphantly insist upon God's being merciful and gracious, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression and sin; but they studiously keep out of sight the other circumstance insisted on, and which points as much to his justice, viz. that he will by no means clear the guilty, *i. e.* without atonement. See Levit. vi. 4, 5, 6, 7.

that

that none should have cause to suppose that any past sins under the Old Covenant, for which no adequate legal atonement was provided, were really remitted without atonement, but that all was done with a view to the great *Christian Sacrifice*, “at *this time*,” that is, in *the Apostles days* manifested to the world, that God might be just, that is, might exercise his *mercy*, consistently with his *justice*, and in that manner be able to *justify* or acquit \* him which believeth in Jesus.

I have not dwelt upon the particular doctrine of atonement by *vicarious sufferings* in this place, because in my view of matters, it is undeniably included in the redemption wrought by Christ, and I shall have occasion to touch upon it hereafter. My only intention and endeavour at present, has been to show, that atonement being necessary in the dispensations of God’s providence, (if the Old Testament is to be consulted,) and being expressly alluded to in so many accounts of the death and sufferings of Christ, the most plausible conjecture as to its use and design is, that God’s mercy and justice might thereby be brought to coalesce, and the former be enabled

\* The Editors seem to admit this sense of *δικαιωσις*, (see Gal. ii. 24,) so that I need not cite authorities, but I cannot help adding Doddridge’s remark on the preceding clause, “that he might be *just* ;” “by *just*,” Mr. Taylor would understand *merciful*, and Mr. Locke, faithful to his promises: but either of these makes but a very cold sense when compared with that which I have here given. It is no way wonderful, that God should be merciful, or faithful to his promises, though the justifier of believing sinners, but that he should be JUST in such an act might have seemed incredible, had we not received such an account of the propitiation and atonement.” See also Veysie’s viiith Sermon, and Magee on Atonement.



freely to act, without imputation of the latter; and the text before us, in my estimation, so far from giving no countenance to it, admirably explains and confirms this doctrine, showing that God particularly set forth, or gave his son, Christ Jesus, to be a mercy seat and propitiation both for past sins and sins to come, that he might be in all his proceedings just, as well in the remission of sins heretofore, or forbearance of punishment, as in the future acquittal and justification of believers. In this point of view the Editors terms, "method of justification," would not be objectionable. For *this* I do maintain to be God's *particular mode* of justification, viz. in consideration of Christ's atonement, ransom, and propitiation:—"so," as our Homilies express it, "the justice and mercy of God did embrace together and fulfilled the mystery of our redemption."

And nothing I think could more concisely, and at the same time more satisfactorily, illustrate this than the *second* passage, which they declare contains, "no allusion to the commonly received doctrine of atonement by vicarious sufferings," viz. 2 Cor. v. 21. "For God hath made him who knew no sin, to be a sin for us, that we may be justified before God through him." Instead of "to be a sin for us," Archbishop Newcome reads a *sin-offering*, which the Editors reject, but without reason for a sin-offering might be so expressed, as Whitby has well shown\*, and Doddridge has not scrupled to adopt it in his Paraphrase. That we might be

\* They also reject the Primate's rendering of Romans viii. 3, "an offering for sin," *περι αμαρτίας*, which however is certainly the term used by the LXX for "an offering for sin," as many most learned commentators have been at the pains to prove.

justified

justified before God, "through him," though an undeniable Scripture truth is not the exact rendering of the Greek, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γινώμεθα δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. Δικαιοσύνη, in this place, seems clearly to be used in the third of the senses mentioned by Beza, and to express the righteousness of Christ, by way of antithesis to the term ἀμαρτία in the preceding clause of the verse; but this so far from being adverse to the doctrine of atonement by vicarious sufferings, seems expressly to confirm it; for if by Christ's interposition and for his sake, we who were "sinners and outlaws," are to be accounted holy, and rendered capable of heavenly blessings, the antithesis demands, that both sin and the punishment of sin should have been undergone by Christ for *our* sakes. Now the Editors admit the sense of the first clause to be, that "Christ who had never violated the law, suffered death *as a transgressor* \*;" but why "as a transgressor," except in the way of vicarious atonement? His death in ratification of a covenant did not require *this*, unless they would insist upon it that the blood of the *Old* Covenant, which Moses sprinkled on the Book, Exodus xxiv. 8, was the blood of expiatory sacrifices, which has appeared to many doubtful, but if it were, then Christ's blood also was the blood of an expiatory sacrifice, and this would decide the

\* They have a way of getting rid of the imputation of sin upon all occasions: thus when the Apostle, Gal. iii. 13, says that Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, their gloss is, "as it were a curse," but why "as it were a curse," if his death had no object but that of bringing the Gentiles into a covenanted state. His ignominy and sufferings were not merely "as it were" ignominy and sufferings, but really and actually such. Newcome's notes support them certainly, but this does not change the case.

case

case as much against them the other way. That Christ should suffer, "*as a transgressor*," merely to ratify a covenant, or attest the sincerity of God's promises, I cannot understand; we might surely say with Lactantius, *Cur non saltem honesto aliquo mortis genere affectus est?* See *Barrow's Works*, Vol. i. p. 468. The allusion that they talk of to the mercy seat, as though the goodness of God there took its stand, to declare his gracious purposes and dispensations to mankind, so far from appearing *beautiful* to me seems quite the contrary, if this could not be without the *unnecessary sufferings* and *disgrace* of an innocent person\*; but beautiful indeed is the allusion, if I may infer that on Christ as a *mercy seat*, the *justice* of God took its stand†, that through him as sole propitiatory, propitiation and propitiator, God might freely dispense his blessings of pardon and forgiveness to every contrite and repentant sinner. Then I can understand what is meant by God's making "him who knew no sin, to be a sin for us," namely, that through *his* sufferings *we* might be justified; that is, *acquitted* and *released* without undergoing the punishment strictly due to sin, or without any mistrust of God's purity and justice. In this manner I can easily comprehend why God permitted his beloved Son, as the

\* The learned Witsius expresses himself to the same effect in his *Œconomia Fœderum*, l. 2. c. 8. See also the 13th c. of his 4th b. on the *Defects of the Old Testament*, as applicable to the above exposition of *Rom. iii. 25, 26*.

† In the Prayer of Neemias recorded in the 2d Book of Maccabees, these two attributes of God are admirably brought together, Κυριε Κυριε ο Θεος ο παντων κτιστης, ο φοβερος, και ισχυρος, δικαιος, και ελεημων, *terribilis et fortis, JUSTUS et MISERICORS*.

Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, "to taste death for every man," and under such *particular circumstances*, which I must still be allowed to insist, do not apply to the ratification of a covenant, (for this passage of "tasting death for every man," is also considered by the Editors, as a mere seal of God's covenant). Before I dismiss this passage, I must notice one other circumstance relating to it: the Apostle plainly describes the Messias as *one* "who knew *no* sin;" but the present Editors will tell you he knew sin as well as others; not indeed moral sin, but legal sin, which they would almost have us believe is the only sin the sacred writers ever intend to speak of. But their management in fixing the charge of legal sin upon Christ, is most curious and most artful. Since the death of Christ *must* be regarded in any other light than that of a sacrificial atonement, they endeavour to make it appear, that it was indispensably necessary as a formal consecration of him to the priestly office. This they think is easily proved by the following passage, Heb. vii. 27, "who needeth not, as the High Priests, daily to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people, for this he did once for all, when he offered up himself." Their comment is as follows: "*this he did,*" i. e. offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins. But Christ in a moral sense was sinless. See ver. 26. and Ch. iv. 15; his sins therefore were merely ceremonial, that is, being a descendant of the House of Judah, ver. 14, he was, as to the Priesthood, in an unconsecrated state\*; and as  
Aaron

\* There is no small embarrassment in their account of Christ's priesthood; if he was duly consecrated to the priesthood, one would think he was a priest, and yet in a note on Heb. x. 14, we



Aaron was consecrated to his priestly office by the blood of animal sacrifices, so Christ was consecrated to his nobler office "by the sacrifice of himself." In the first place Christ was *not* called or consecrated according to the order of Aaron, but according to the order of Melchisedec; see Hebrews vii. 11. See also Ch. v. 4—11. Indeed the Editors fully admit this in their note on Chap. vii. 3. Secondly, The particular form by which he *was* consecrated is so circumstantially delivered, verses 20, 21, that I cannot avoid believing, that "*the sacrifice of himself*" was *not* so necessary a part of that form: thirdly, this very form is again alluded to, ver. 28, to show, not how Christ was consecrated according to the ancient forms, but how he *differed from* the Aaronical priesthood, who *had infirmity*, and were consecrated "without an oath." Our High Priest on the contrary, being consecrated with an oath, and being "*holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners,*" ver. 26. Fourthly, so far from needing, as these Editors pretend, to sacrifice for his own sins, the Apostle

we are told on the authority of Mr. Lindsey, that it was no real part of his character. We are taught besides, to believe, that his consecration was an Aaronical consecration, and yet he was not a priest after the order of Aaron but of Melchisedec. I rather wonder, that in order to be still more intelligible they did not conclude with Dr. Priestley's final remark upon all these passages, namely, that after all it is only by way of *figure* that he can be said to be a priest at all; being in reality no more a priest than he was a door, a vine, or any other thing to which he was occasionally compared.

As an antidote to such unaccountable scepticism, I would recommend the perusal of Dr. Outram's 1st and 2d Chapters of his 2d Book de Sacrificiis, as well as the conclusion of his seventh Ch. de Intercessione Christi,

says,

says, he *needeth not* do so, ver. 27 \*: but for the *sins of the people*, he *did* “offer up himself,” *εφάπαξ*, once. But if this should be thought to be an unwarrantable dividing of the text, and that there is still room to infer that Christ did offer for his own sins, in offering up himself, Grotius’s *exposition* must be in part received, namely, that by his own sins, could only be meant † “*dolores illos qui solent peccatorum pœnæ esse, et quos Christus occasione etiam peccatorum humani generis toleravit ‡*,” not any actual or personal sins, moral or ceremonial; but the punishment of the sins of others, though in this he erred, as Whitby has shown; but that he meant to discharge

\* See Beza in loc.

† As *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἀμαρτιῶν*, as applied to the Aaronical Priests included their families, it has here been supposed to relate to Christ’s *own* Apostles: see Johnson, 103, 104.

‡ That any actual contaminations could be intended is contradictory to Heb. ix. 14, where Christ is said to have offered himself “*spotless* to God,” *ἀμωμον*, which could not be the case, if he had sins of his own to cover by this sacrifice of his life; his being born of any other tribe than that of Levi, might have rendered him unfit for the Aaronical priesthood, but could have been no blot in his character as to the priesthood of the order of Melchisedec. Beza’s Marginal Comment. on ver. 27, is as follows, “*aliud argumentum, Levitici victimas repetitis vicibus, primum pro se, deinde pro populo offerebant. Christus autem non pro se, sed pro aliis, non Victimam sed seipsum, non sæpesed semel obtulit, neque id mirum (inquit) videri debet cum illi sint infirmi, iste vero sit cum Jurejurando Pontifex æternus consecratus.*” It is a very remarkable expression of Philo, on Levit. iv. 3, “if the Priest that is anointed do sin,” &c. The *true* High Priest, says Philo, he who is not falsely so called, is free from sin, this High Priest, says he, in another place, is *ὁ ἀνθρώπων*, not a man, but *Λόγος Θεῶν*, the divine WORD, free from all Sins, he adds, voluntary and involuntary. See these citations in Bishop Kidder’s *Demonstration of the Messiah*, Part III. p. 105.

Christ from all imputation of personal impurity, moral or ceremonial, is evident from his rendering of *αμιαντος*, as applied to Christ, ver. 26. "Qui non tantum pollutus non fuerit illis contaminationibus externis de quibus agitur, Levit. xxii. sed nec ullo vitio, vid. Jac. i. 27, 1 Pet. i. 4:" see also Grotius on Rom. vi. 10. I have been obliged to notice this misrepresentation of matters, because the Editors actually take upon them to assert, that Christ only offered up himself for the sins of the world, exactly as he *offered up himself for his own sins*, that is, to *consecrate* believers, and bring them out of an unholy into a holy state; and this they would have us believe is the utmost that is meant by our being "redeemed," as St. Peter expresses it, "with the precious blood of Christ, as of a spotless and unblemished Lamb." Many learned writers, I am aware, have regarded the Christian Sacrifice as, in one respect, an antitype of the blood of priestly consecration, Exod. xxix, Levit. viii: but upon a very attentive perusal of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it appears to me to have been quite unnecessary to the consecration of Jesus Christ, and by no means to be insisted upon as *such* by the Apostle. It is certainly true, that the proper terms of the Levitical consecration are applied to our Saviour in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and even to the sufferings of our Lord, Ch. ii. ver. 10; but that very passage would lead me to a different interpretation of the word *τελειωσαι*, for it was not merely in his sacerdotal character that he was thus *perfected*, but as the Captain of our salvation, and though these very sufferings did certainly qualify him for our High Priest with respect to the participation of our nature which he took upon him, Ch. ii. ver. 17, yet it does not appear to have been necessary in the way of *consecration*; the very next

verse

verse indeed speaks of him, not as one of the sanctified, but as the sanctifier, which he became through the sacrifice and oblation of himself in the way of expiation, and by which he purged our sins \*. The Ram of consecration under the Law was slain to sanctify the Levitical Priesthood, and the bullock to make Atonement, as among the ceremonies of their consecration, but the word of the oath consecrated the Son for ever, who being a Priest after the similitude of Melchisedec was made, not after the Law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless Life, vii. 15, 16.

It is unnecessary to dwell longer on this, because it still remains to be shown, how the blood of Christ could be effectual even as a sacerdotal consecration, except as an expiatory offering, for the Aaronical consecration undoubtedly consisted not only in gifts but in sacrifices for sin †; it should be considered, that had Christ needed such a sacrifice in order to his own consecration, he could not have expiated the sins of others, see Psalm xlix. 7, cited by Barrow, Vol. i. 466, and the Appendix to Mr. Sharp's three Tracts on the *Syntax* and *Pronunciation* of the *Heb.* tongue, p. 87, so that we need be aware how we surrender this point to the Unitarians, who are always upon the watch to take advantage of it. In the present case, certainly the disqualification insisted upon is

\* When our Saviour says, John xviii. 19, "And for their sakes I sanctify myself," the meaning is, I devote myself as an offering. See Whitby, &c.

† Such undoubtedly was the *Θυσια τελειωσης*. The only question is whether this can be said to have been offered for his own consecration, or that as a High Priest he offered *such* for the sins of the world.



purely ceremonial, but it has the effect of turning our views from the *Expiatory* nature of the Christian sacrifice. The consecration of Christ was in fact his spotless obedience, through which "being made perfect" (or consecrated, for so the term *τελειωθείς* implies,) "he became the Author of eternal salvation unto all that obey him; named of God, an High Priest after the order of Melchisedec:" (Heb. v. 9, 10.) This includes the whole process; the "naming of God," refers probably to the oath by which he was fore-appointed in the decree of God, and his unsinning and immaculate obedience consummated the consecration, by enabling him to offer such a pure and unblemished atonement, as might be effectual to the procurement of man's redemption: see Scott's *Christian Life*, and Outram de consecratione Christi. That the Sacrifice of his blood might be effectual to the *consecration* of believers, I do not deny, but if so, it was, I conceive, solely in consequence of the immaculate offering of Christ's body in the way of expiation and atonement. This gave us power to approach with confidence the throne of God's grace, through Christ our crucified Mediator and Redeemer: see Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice*, Chap. ii. Sect. i. p. 101. Though I do not by any means agree with the Author just cited in all his arguments, yet I am quite willing to allow that this facility of access to the Father without any other formal lustrations, (Baptism perhaps excepted,) is one of the great privileges of the Christian Church, purchased by the blood of Christ.

THE passage, Rom. ix. 5, demands a particular consideration. I was not surprised to see how the Editors have rendered it, "Who are Israelites? whose is the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of the Temple, and the Promises? whose are the Fathers, and of whom by NATURAL DESCENT, Christ came. God, who is over all, be blessed for ever." The first thing I shall object to is the rendering *το κατὰ σάρκα* by natural descent. It must to be sure mean by natural descent in some respect, that is, in regard to the derivation of his humanity. But had his human nature been altogether according to the common course of things, *το κατὰ σάρκα* would have been not only useless \*, but in my estimation, totally ridiculous. *Το κατὰ φύσιν* would surely have been the more regular expression for the natural descent of Jesus, as we may see by referring to Gal. ii. 15, Rom. xi. 24. There are indeed, I will admit, several passages, in which *κατὰ σάρκα* may be said to imply natural descent, but if I concede this, I must insist upon the opposition which in the same texts is generally expressed or implied. Ishmael in Galatians iv. 23, is undoubtedly said to be born of the bond-woman, *κατὰ σάρκα*, after the flesh, or indeed according to the common course of nature, but Isaac who came by promise not so; his birth was miraculous and *δια τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*, out of the ordinary course of nature, and merely by virtue of the promise made to Abraham: so that if *κατὰ σάρκα* means by natural descent in this place, it is in the

\* See Lactantius on this, Lib. iv. §. 13, and Joshua Allen's Sermons, 1751.

way of contrast, and so I think it is undoubtedly used in Rom. ix. 5 \*; nor can I conceive it to be used otherwise; there is no occasion for it; it might even have offended those Jews who were inclined to study the types and allegories of the Old Testament, and certainly must have operated against the calling of the Gentiles, St. Paul's great object and commission. The same writer who could allege against Ishmael, that very circumstance of his being born *κατα σαρκα*, as a reason for his being set aside, and the preference given to the Child of Promise, could scarcely intend to fix that very reproach upon the Saviour of the world, who was in his estimation the very Antitype of that Jewish Allegory, in being born, not *κατα σαρκα*, merely, or in the ordinary course of nature, but by promise and prophecy and miracle, as Isaac was. When we consider these things, (which *should be considered* when we presume to scrutinise Paul's particular sentiments,) we cannot for a moment hesitate to give that force to the *το κατα σαρκα* of the Apostle, and to regard it as bearing an immediate and particular reference to a different descent and another nature. And if this is its meaning, some-

\* It is used so also, Ch. i. 3, and even in ver. 3, of this very Chapter; St. Paul evidently alluding to a spiritual brotherhood and connection with the Gentile converts. The article inserted, ver. 5, gives force to the expression, as Beza observes, "*Vim habet excipiendi alteram naturam divinam videlicet quam postea describit.*" Grotius's note also is to the purpose, "*Non secundum το Θειον quod in ipso, sed secundum το Ανθρωπινον.*" This was written before the publication of Dr. Carpenter's Letters in reply to Mr. Veysie, who refers us, p. 145, to ver. 3, to show that *το κατα σαρκα* does *not* infer two natures. I see no occasion to vary my remarks. They are already as applicable to Dr. C.'s objections as I could desire them to be.

thing

thing must needs be expected to follow; if he was of the race of Israel, “according to the flesh,” (for as for the terms natural descent, they are in a most frivolous manner evasive,) a question naturally arises what was he else? What was he *not according to the flesh*? The Editors talk of climaxes, a regular ascending climax would expressly require such an addition as the Apostle makes. “Whose are the fathers, and of whom, according to the Flesh Christ came.” Here is no climax, rather a bathos or sinking; he could not be better or greater than Abraham or Isaac, by this *fleshly origin*, and to insist so particularly upon it, would have rendered the matter more marked and certain; but there is a magnificent rise in the climax when we come to read that this Christ, who came of the fathers according to the flesh, was indeed and in reality Θεὸς εὐλογητός \* εἰς τὰς Αἰωνάς, GOD blessed for ever!

We must despair of ever being able to settle the sense of this passage, to the satisfaction of Socinians and Unitarians, because they take refuge in so many alterations and conjectural emendations. With some, Θεὸς must be expunged upon no better authority than an accidental omission on the part of St. Cyprian and St. Hilary, or a bare probability that Chrysostom read it otherwise. If this should not be sufficient to help them, the passage must be differently pointed; and if this will not do ὁ ὢν must be changed

\* *Newcome* thus paraphrases the text, adding *authorities* for every term as applied to *Christ*, “whose ancestors were the Patriarchs; and of whom, as to his *human lineage*, Christ is descended, *who is over all*, [Ephes. i. 22, 23; Phil. ii. 9; Matth. xxviii. 18.] *God* [Matth. i. 23; Heb. i. 8; John i. 1.] *blessed for ever*. [Rev. v. 12, 13.]



to ὦν ὁ, and the accents altered; with such liberties as these, they may make any thing surely of any passage. It is fit however, that such alterations should be duly examined into; as for the omission of Θεός, Grotius, to whom they refer, certainly does observe, that Erasmus had remarked that Cyprian, Hilary, and Chrysostom appear to have read it ὁ ὦν ἐπὶ πάντων εὐλογητός εἰς τὰς Αἰώνας. He also tells us, that “ex Syro apparet veteres Codices ita habuisse,” in which he was wrong, as Le Clerc acknowledges. “Hugo Grotius iis addit Syrum Interpretem, qua in re fallitur.” He would have done better too, had he not trusted so much to Erasmus on the other points, for Beza has shown, that if Θεός is omitted by Cyprian lib. advers. Judæos, cap. 5, and by Hilary in his citation of Psalm xii. 2, it *must* have happened “librarium vitio,” the thing speaking for itself, “cùm utrobique citetur ob hoc ipsum hic locus, ut probetur DEI Nomen Christo verè et propriè competere:” and he adds with good reason, that even supposing it is omitted in their writings, “satis expressa sit Dei naturæ explicatio cum Dicitur, ὁ ὦν ἐπὶ πάντων, qui est supra omnes\*.” As to Chrysostom, Griesbach as well as Grotius is cited for *his* omissions. It appears (this is all the Editors venture to say,) to have been wanting in Chrysostom’s and some other ancient copies; “*some other*,” no doubt, refers to Grotius’s enumeration of Cyprian and Hilary, and the Syriac Version; but what Griesbach says of Chrysostom does by no means amount to any authority for the omission; his words are “Chrys. ad. h. l. post κατὰ σάρκα, *præterit* Verba, passes over the words, ὁ ὦν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, et statim progreditur, &c. How

\* See also Pearson on the Creed, fol. Edit. p. 132.

could he pass over or pass by these words, if they were not in his copy? but Griesbach adds, not by way surely of approving the omission; "Sed in Textu et alibi leguntur ista;" he might well say alibi, for it is to be found as we read it in all the Versions, not excepting the Syriac, and has the consent of most of the ancient Fathers, NOT EXCEPTING CHRYSOSTOM! who in his vth Hom. de Incomprehens. Dei Natura, Vol. i. p. 341. Paris Edit. 1636, and Hom. 3. in cap. 1. Evang. Johan. cites the very words *supposed* to be omitted in his copy, and even acknowledges that Christ was GOD OVER ALL.

As for their attempt to point the passage so as to serve their purposes, (a method Erasmus had recourse to, but very clumsily, as Whitby has shown;), we shall cite *against them*, Dr. Priestley, their great favourite. He by a sort of oversight in defending the very pause adopted by the Editors, who put a colon after the word "*came*," observes, that "since no ancient manuscripts are pointed, all the pointings have been made, and the different sentences distinguished, as *fallible* men have thought the best sense required." This leaves the question just where it was; some *fallible* men have put a comma after "*came*," and other *fallible* men have put a colon; which of these have shown themselves most *fallible* still remains to be decided. Socinus rejects the colon, and men must be very fallible indeed to be satisfied with so imperfect a description of matters, as this sentence contains, if we are to stop at "*came*;" they must first suffer themselves to be deluded into a strong suspicion that Christ had some origin different from his fleshly descent from the Patriarchs, and after all be content to be put off with an ecphonema instead

stead of an explanation. For let them allege what they will to the contrary το καὶ σαρκὰ certainly carries on our view to some other distinction\*.

But supposing the pause corrected from a comma to a colon; are we to trust to their assertions, that “God who is over all, be blessed for ever,” “equally well suits the construction.” Socinus thought otherwise, and rejected the colon on this very account; he judged it to be quite unusual and unnatural, and so it seems; “God or the Lord be blessed for ever and ever,” is not itself an unusual expression in Scripture at all; it occurs frequently, and almost uniformly in the following form, Εὐλογητος ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ—Εὐλογητος Κύριος ὁ Θεός—Θεός always has the article prefixed, and for the most part follows Εὐλογητος. That the latter clause of the verse should be separated from the rest seems the last refuge of Unitarians. If ὁ ὦν has the force of ὁς ἐστὶ, the whole differs scarcely at all from Rom. i. 25; and that it has this force has not only been expressly maintained by critics, but may be said to be fully admitted by the Editors, not only in their own rendering of this very passage, but of John i. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 31; and as to the punctuation of the clause itself, it might safely be asserted that ἐπὶ πάντων alone would be sufficient to establish the point of Christ’s divinity; (see *Pearson*, fol. 132,) or ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, or Εὐλογῆσθαι εἰς τὰς αἰώνας, A. as chap. i. 25, where the latter is plainly pre-

\* See the objections to this corrected punctuation in the *Eclectic Review*, vol. v. p. 331, and the excellent remarks in the same place on the conjectural emendation of ὦν ὁ.

dicated of the *Creator*, and the construction is so similar\*.

The Editors assure the public, that it is probable the early Christian writers understood the words as they render them, because they do not apply them to Christ, but pronounce it to be rashness and impiety to say, that "Christ was God over all." What early Christian writers the Editors mean, I know not; one of their favourite commentators, Mr. Jones, in his Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans, says, "had the original stood as it now does, the early fathers would have cited this clause in proof of the divinity of Christ. But neither Justin, (*I believe*) nor Irenæus, nor Tertullian has quoted it with this view." Irenæus, in the xviii<sup>th</sup> chap. of his third Book, expressly quotes it in proof of our Saviour being the son of God, as well as the son of man, "*filius Dei, filius hominis FACTUS; Primogenitus in omni Conditione, de semine David secundum Carnem, [but] Emmanuel, non tantum hominem.*" Whether Irenæus understood the full force of the term Emmanuel, must be left to the reader. In our estimation this alone is proof enough of his divinity. But Tertullian, in his Treatise against Praxeas, so far from pronouncing it to be rashness and impiety,

\* That the fathers thought the sense complete without the words *Ευλογητός εις τας αιωνας* is evident from their manner of citing the passage. Athanasius omits them; he says, Paul thus writes in his Epist. to the Romans, *ων οι Πατερες, και εξων ο Χριστος το καλα σαρκα ο ων επι Παλιν Θεος*. Theodoret, once cites in the same manner. Epiphanius also Advers. Hæreses, and Gregory Nyssen. Other fathers insert it at length, so that it seems to have been a matter of indifference whether a pause should be made at *Θεος*, or the sentence completed. The Editors make the very same break in the note—"of whom was Christ, of whom was God who is over all."



to say that Christ was God over all, happens, contrary also to Mr. Jones's fancy and belief, to declare most expressly, that he thinks it no rashness or impiety to say, that Christ was God over all, *because* the Apostle had so asserted in proper terms; his words are, "Apostolum sequor, ut si pariter nominandi fuerint pater et filius, Deum Patrem appellem, et J. Christum Dominum nominem. Solum autem Christum potero DEUM dicere, *sicut* idem Apostolus (Rom. ix.) Ex quibus Christus *qui est*, (inquit) Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne." By how many others of the ancient fathers the passage is cited as it stands in our copies, may be seen in Whitby, or Bishop Bull's Defens. Fid. Nic. chap. v. Sect. II. §. 3, and in Wordsworth's Letters to Granville Sharp, the reader will find the following citations at length, one from Athanasius, Vol. ii. 1. p. 14; one from Theodoret, pp. 31, 32; one from Epiphanius, p. 70; four from Gregory Nyssen, 73, 74, 75; and one from Cyril of Alexandria, p. 83.

We have still to notice the proposed emendation of reading *αὐτὸς* for *ὁ* *ὢς*, "of whom was God," instead of "who is God." This is stated in the notes to be a very plausible conjecture, of Crellius, Slichtingius, Whitby and Taylor; plausible conjectures as to what *might have been* written, are strong evidences of a peculiar feeling in regard to what *is* written \*; where the sense is incomplete, or contradictory,

\* "Who does not perceive, says the learned Reviewer in the Eclectic Review, that the conjectural criticism of an interested party, in his own cause, and in defiance of positive evidence, is little better than subornation of testimony in a court of law." As these Remarks were written long before I had

dictory, or unintelligible, plausible conjectures deserve to be listened to, but where the sense appears complete, where it is even illustrative of what precedes, and where it is sufficiently perspicuous, plausible conjectures as to a different reading can only tend to confound matters. Had our MSS. and Versions supported the reading which the Editors approve,  $\omega\upsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon\ \tau\iota\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota$ , what an outcry would have been raised against any plausible conjecture on the part of a Trinitarian, that perhaps the true reading ought to be  $\delta\ \omega\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ . But it seems this would complete the climax,  $\Omega\upsilon\iota\varsigma\ \eta\ \nu\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ ,  $\Omega\upsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\Omega\upsilon\iota\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\Omega\upsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ . "Of whom was the adoption, of whom were the fathers, of whom was Christ, of whom was God who is over all." Nor is it likely (add the Editors) when the Apostle was professedly summing up the privileges of the Jews, that he should have overlooked the great privilege which was their chief boast, that "God was in a peculiar sense their God." If Christ was God, this great privilege was not overlooked in stating him to be so, and as we have shown before, nothing could be more magnificently complete than the winding up of the climax, with the incarnation of the Saviour of the world. Besides, if Christ was the  $\Delta\omicron\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , which appeared to the Patriarchs, the visible Jehovah which appeared to Moses on Mount Sinai, as we have also endeavoured to show, he was particularly the God and King of Israel, and the glory of his people. So that to pretend that this privilege is overlooked by rendering it as the

had an opportunity of seeing the very able Review referred to, the coincidence of our sentiments must surely imply, that the conclusion we have both drawn from the same premises is too glaringly obvious to be mistaken, or overlooked.

received

received text has it, is a *Petitio Principii*, and like all their other remarks, leaves the main question totally undecided. But “it is not likely,” they would have us believe, “that the Apostle would pass over that great privilege of the Jews, “that God was in a peculiar sense their God.” But unfortunately for their argument *nothing* could be *more likely*, if we are to believe St. Paul himself. The whole drift and purport of his Epistle is to break down this distinction, to induce the Jews to receive the Gentiles into fellowship, and not to reject Christ, through any prejudices to the contrary. This is no *plausible conjecture* to help us out of a difficulty; it is plainly written, and needs no transposition of words or particles. “Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also. Seeing it is one God who will justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith,” chap. iii. 29, 30. That the true God was the God of the Jews, had been previously and sufficiently implied in the terms  $\acute{\omega}\nu \eta \upsilon\iota\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\alpha$ ; the reading proposed therefore would not only have been unnecessary, but a mere matter of tautology, had it been so peculiarly the object of the Apostle to magnify this privilege of the Jews, whereas, to show that the Messiah of the Jews, was indeed,  $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\omega}\nu \epsilon\pi\iota \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu \Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , completes the climax in favour of the Gentiles, and admirably expressed the feelings of the Apostle\*.

\* Mr. Middleton's Work on the Greek Article should be consulted on this passage, and I beg leave here to return my thanks to the Reverend Francis Huish, of Clisthydon, Devonshire, for some references and remarks on it, communicated by letter.

EPHESIANS i. 10. The Editors in their note upon this verse take notice of Mr. Locke's suggestion, that "things in heaven and things on earth," may be understood to signify the Jewish and Gentile world. This remark of Mr. Locke's, say they, is both curious and important, and will serve to explain many passages in this Epistle, and in that to the Colossians, which was written at the same time, and in the *same figurative* style. But the question remains, is it after all a *figurative* style or not? Mr. Locke produces some instances to prove it so, and I do not deny the force of them as mere instances, but as applicable to this particular passage, I confess, I think them of no moment at all. The beginning of Mr. Locke's own note, in which the above remark occurs, convinces me, that he had much higher notions of the original supremacy of the Son of God than would at all quadrate with the doctrines of the Improved Version; he particularly carries back our views to that first rule and dominion of Christ, when the rebellious angels of heaven revolted from the kingdom of God; but the Editors of the Improved Version will tell us that all this is a dream\*; that nothing can be more absurd than to credit these stories of rebellious and revolting Angels, which Mr. Locke, (a pretty good judge of evidence,) declares to be plainly though not fully revealed in holy Scripture, and to be proved by "*manifest indications.*" Archbishop Newcome expressly says, "the things in heaven and upon earth," mean, not *only*

\* They expressly say so indeed in almost the very next note.



*Angels*, but all mankind, whether Jews or Gentiles. The amiable and excellent Doddridge cannot bear the confinement of the passage merely to Jews and Gentiles: “both angels and men,” says he, “were at first in sweet and harmonious *subjection* to the *Son of God*, the great Creator of both; but *Man* having broke himself off from the society, the *Son of Man* by his humiliation and sufferings *recovers* all who believe in him, and in his human nature *presides over the kingdom*; to which in the world of glory, *they* and *his Angels* belong. This interpretation,” he adds, “presents SO NOBLE A VIEW that NO OTHER WILL BEAR A COMPARISON!” and in this we perfectly agree; indeed, I must have leave to say, that I long ago endeavoured to vindicate this noble passage from the low and debasing interpretation which the Editors allude to, in a work little known, but which I have still a confident persuasion, has much support from the language of Scripture, I mean my book on the plurality of worlds, entitled ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, ΕΙΣ ΜΕΤΕΤΗΣ. There I have taken account of Mr. Locke’s opinion, and ventured nevertheless to give to the passage, and to the mediation of Christ, a compass and extent that may fairly be said to comprehend the whole universe. I would not say so much upon the subject, but that I think I see, an evident attempt in this note, to turn our views from the grand objects which it is peculiarly calculated to set before us, and to lower the expressions relating to Christ, in this and others of St. Paul’s Epistles. When this design is made so apparent, it surprises us to turn to Archbishop Newcome, and read the motto *he* prefixes to the Epistle, from the great favourite of Socinians, the learned Grotius. “Paulus Jam

vetus in Apostolico munere, et ob Evangelium Romæ vinctus, ostendit quanta sit vis Evangelii præ doctrinis omnibus: quomodo omnia Dei Consilia *ab omni ævo* eo tetenderint, quam admiranda sit in eo Dei efficacia: rerum sublimitatem adæquans verbis sublimioribus quam ulla unquam habuit lingua humana \*." I will not say *it* is trick to have suppressed all this; but surely I may say, that it is good management, *as long as it is not detected.*

Ephesians vi. 12. We are told in plain terms in the note upon this verse, that "this scenic representation borrowed from the oriental philosophy, is not to be understood literally." "Principalities, powers, &c. express a personification of all wicked opposition to the Gospel," and no more. The armour, it is added, with which we are directed to oppose them being wholly allegorical; the persons against whom it is to be used, *must* also be figurative and allegorical. If the armour, described by the Apostle, be *wholly* allegorical, I should fear there was no truth, no righteousness, no Gospel of peace, no faith, no salvation. I grant that the *girdle* of truth, and the *breast-plate* of righteousness, and the *helmet* of salvation are allegorical, but there is at least as much of the armour perfectly literal and real; but I am not inclined to argue the matter with the Editors, I would only beg leave to state what appears to me particularly objectionable, in so peremptory a negation of a doctrine hitherto generally credited. To go no farther than their own chosen

\* That Grotius considered angels to be included may be seen both by his note on this passage and on Coloss. i. 20, where he expressly says, the terms imply "*pios Angelos, et pios homines.*"

authority, how very contrary is their broad assertion, that the passage is not to be understood literally, to the sentiments of Archbishop Newcome; "against spiritual wickedness in heavenly things \*," he conceives to imply EITHER the wickedness of evil SPIRITS exercised in things relating to Heaven; OR evil SPIRITS properly supposed to occupy the air; OR SPIRITS originally wicked in Heaven. And he adds a note of importance, that "some of the ancient interpreters observe that God has not assigned any dominion to evil spirits; but that men voluntarily serve them." Here then, perhaps, we are brought to a footing. The *principalities* and *powers* of these evil spirits may perhaps be as allegorical as the *helmet* and *breast-plate* and *girdle* of the Evangelical armour, but the spirits themselves may be as real and actual as *truth* and *righteousness*, *faith* and *salvation*.

---

PHILIPPIANS ii. 6, 7, 8, 9. This celebrated passage is sadly mangled by the Editors; being in the form of God, we are told, is being "invested

\* "In heavenly things," *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*: this expression seems to have embarrassed commentators considerably. It has generally been rendered in heavenly *places*; I am rather surprised that advantage has not been taken of a various reading noticed by Griesbach, *ἐν τοῖς ὑπερσυναῖς*. This would particularly accord with the popular opinion to which the Primate alludes, and which Scripture seems to countenance, namely, that the air or sub-celestial regions were inhabited by the evils spirits. This was certainly a Jewish tradition, and one, which, as Mr. Mede observes, St. Paul was disposed to approve.

with

with extraordinary divine powers," see Lindsey's 2d address,—“ did not easily grasp at the resemblance to God,” *οὐκ ἀρπαγμον ᾠψάτο τὸ εἶναι Ἰσὰ Θεῷ*, is “ he did not make an ostentatious display of his miraculous powers,” “ divesting himself of the form of God,” only signifies, it seems, that he relinquished his miraculous powers, when he submitted to indignity and crucifixion; to be made in the likeness of men, means only of *common* and *ordinary* mortals, which is also intended by the phrase, “ being found in fashion as a man.” This is sad trifling surely, and a miserable specimen of scriptural knowledge. Dr. Carpenter's exposition, in his letters to Mr. *Veysie*, appears to me still more extraordinary; he thinks it means, that Christ thought it no improper assumption to be “ *as God*,” because he was his representative; he conceives that “ being in the form of God,” must be the same as *being instead of God*, and that it was even his *duty* therefore, to claim both *honour* and *authority*, “ *as God*,” when he spake and acted as such. But, let me ask, did any *other* representative of God think it no undue assumption to claim *honour as God*, the *Jehovah Angel* excepted? Dr. C. declares, that “ there is not *one* expression in this passage which *implies* that Jesus possessed a *superior nature*\*;” and yet *willingly allows*, that “ the whole *may admit* of a convenient explanation upon the *supposition* that that was the case.” Now this is as much as I want; because except Socinians and Unitarians, there is no denomination of Christians, I believe, that does not fully *suppose* it to be the case, that Christ *did* possess a superior nature, and was undoubtedly in a state of glory before he came

\* See on the term *ὑπαρχον*, Mr. Middleton's reference to *Suidas* in his doctrine of the Greek Article, p. 539.



into this world. "And accordingly, we are told as plainly as can be, that he came down from heaven, John iii. 13; xviii. 3; xvi. 28. That he was before all things, and by him do all things exist, Col. i. 17. That all things were made by him: and without him was not any thing made that was made, John i. 3. That he was the WORD that was in the beginning with God, and was God. And besides this, the extraordinary love of God in not withholding his only-begotten Son, but freely giving him up for mankind, is spoken of in such a manner, as proves him to have been a much greater being than a mere man, though made for a little while lower than the angels; and this is clearly intimated in the words of Christ to the Pharisees; what think ye of Christ? whose Son is He? They say unto him the son of *David*. He saith unto them, how then does *David* in spirit call him Lord? saying the Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right-hand 'till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If *David* then call him Lord, how is he his son? Matth. xxii. 42, &c. Mark xii. 37; Luke xx. 41; Psalm cx. 1. The texts, that can only be explained upon these principles, are very numerous; which the Socinians attempt to explain away into a figurative meaning; but without success; for he that shall without prejudice examine their interpretation of the beginning of St. John's Gospel, will find it as far-fetched and as unsatisfactory as Dr. Henry More's Philosophical and Metaphysical Cabala upon the three first chapters of Genesis\*."

If I were to say that the Editors never read Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, or Bishop Bull's *Primitiva et Apost. Traditio*, &c. I should think myself guilty of great impertinence, and yet I am

\* See Ben Mord, Lett.

sorry to say their endeavours seem to me to be directed to the burying of all such works in perfect oblivion. And this I confess is among the most prevailing motives that have led me to engage in this undertaking, that I may at least raise *my* feeble voice of warning to my fellow Christians, not to suffer themselves to be seduced and turned aside from studies of this nature. Bishop Pearson and Bishop Bull were such scholars as the world seldom sees, and perhaps indeed will never see again; if the present *enlightening* system continues to receive so much *blind* encouragement. These two giants in literature, particularly Biblical Criticism, long ago complained of the received text, the one impliedly, the other in express terms, for inserting, in this passage, viz. Philipp. ii. 7, two copulative conjunctions not warranted by the original; thus making distinct propositions, of a connected sentence, to the great disparagement of the important truth intended to be conveyed by the terms used. Here then we might have hoped to have received help from the Improved Version; but far otherwise, the two interpolated conjunctions are retained without the slightest mark of doubt or suspicion, though they are both omitted by Griesbach, without a single various reading alleged in their favour. By this error, (which I firmly believe to be a complete oversight, but not the more creditable on that account) they are certainly the better enabled to confound the humiliation of the Messiah with his exinanition; the difference between these is sufficiently marked in the original, not only by the omission of the two interpolated copulatives spoken of above, but by the *insertion* of *one* immediately afterwards, for thus should the whole passage be read—"Who being (or rather

*subsisting*, ὑπαρχων), in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be *equal*\* with God; but emptied himself, *taking* the form of a servant, *being made* in the likeness of man." This expresses his exinanition, namely, the voluntary assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man; and *then* follows, "AND being found in fashion as a man, he HUMBLED himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" in this consisted his humiliation, subsequent to his assumption of the likeness of man. Instead of this the Editors would resolve the whole into his humiliation, in that *he suffered, not exerting his miraculous powers to effectuate his own deliverance!!*

Griesbach indeed attempts to vary the punctuation so as to give some assistance to their interpretations, though as it happens, they do not avail themselves of it. He puts a stop after Ἀνθρώπος in the 8th verse, so as to break the connection between that and what follows; but it appears to me that nothing can be more manifestly wrong. The copulative seems particularly wanted to introduce the terms ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτόν, and therefore standing in all copies, before the words σχηματι εὐρέθεις ὡς ἄνθρωπος, connects the latter with the former as its nominative case. Surprised as I felt myself at this novel punctuation of Griesbach, I of course was tempted to examine into his authorities, but I have here to lament my trifling command of books; of those in my possession, I find but two that at all support him. These are, Grotius, who exhibits not the passage at full length, and therefore is somewhat doubtful, and the Louvain Editors of the

\* See Pearson also on this.

Vulgate, 1523, who certainly put a stop in the 8th verse after *Homo*. The received text has only comma's, so that the 8th verse is as it were all connected with the 7th; but in general the stop is put at the end of verse 7. This is the pointing of the old Latin and Beza, of the Glasgow Edition from Wetstein, and is adopted by Pearson, Bull, Wells, Doddridge, Newcome, and the Editors of the Improved Version, who use the common pointing, though they manage to confound the passages.

---

COLOSSIANS, chap. i. Perhaps in the whole of this Improved Version we meet with nothing more justly to be complained of than the extraordinary mode of explaining this Chapter. Their model Archbishop Newcome must surely have some credit with them as a Biblical critic and scholar, or his Version would not have been selected in the way it has been, and yet certainly his opinions are often slighted and disregarded as though he were an idiot. We shall proceed regularly through the notes. Ver. 15, "The first born of the whole creation." The note tells us, that this reading is particularly adopted from the Primate's margin, and therefore marked N. m. the reading in his text being "every creature," marked therefore N. and immediately connected with these conspicuous references to the Archbishop, it follows, the Apostle explains his meaning, ver. 18; that is, as they expressly assert in their next note, "Christ is called the first born of the creation, because he is the first who was raised from the dead to an immortal



mortal life:" the whole note we are speaking of is only one line; the Archbishop's note on the same passage is little longer, but as different as it is possible for any thing to be, for he expressly assures us that we are to look for the Apostle's explanation, not in verse 18, but in verse 16, which tells us, that he was called the first-born of the "whole creation," or of "every creature," because "by him all things were created that are in Heaven, and that are on earth," &c. His whole note is this, ver. 15. *the first born.*] Immediately derived from the invisible God, John i. 14, before the whole creation, as the *next verse* proves. But we are told by the Editors, that "by him all things were created," by no means intends the creation of natural substances, but figuratively the great change wrought in the moral world by the preaching of Christ; but the Archbishop's note is simply this, (or notes rather) *by him,*] as the instrumental cause—*were created.*"] "Here a *proper* creation is meant, and *not* a figurative one, to good works\*." Thrones and dominions, &c. the Editors tell us merely imply the fanciful orders of beings in the Jewish demonology, *borrowed* from the oriental philosophy; but the Primate much more gravely and properly tells us, that they imply the several orders of Angels, who were created *for* † Christ, that he might be their head,

\* That a metaphorical creation, that is, *the New Creation* as it is commonly called could not be intended by this passage of the Apostle to the Colossians, is so demonstratively proved by the learned Pearson, that I grieve to think it can be necessary to point such a matter out to the world. See the fol. Edit. 1723, p. 116.

† An undeniable proof, says the learned Wells, of the divinity of Christ, and that supreme worship is due to him, since supreme worship is evidently due from the creature to him, for whose service and glory the said creature is made.

and

and might be worshipped and served by them, Philipp. ii. 10. Now all this testimony to the commonly received doctrines, on the part of the learned Primate is not only suppressed, but peremptorily contradicted by their own arguments, while such continual references *appear* to be made to his Version, that the letter N occurs no less than nine times in two pages; so dim sighted must his Grace have been by their account, as not to have the least suspicion of what they assert to be perfectly *evident* from a mere consideration of the terms used, so that were they to say they only meddled with his Version, and not with his notes, they would infer, that he was not capable of understanding the very terms of his own translation; surely this is using the Archbishop most cruelly, and very unfairly exposing him to the scorn and ridicule of the unlearned\*. Ver. 19, they render thus; "for it has pleased the Father to inhabit all fulness by him." The Greek is, *οτι εν αυτω ευδοκησε παν το πληρωμα κατοικησαι*. The Primate as nearly as can be follows the received text. In the Monthly Repository a

\* It happens that the two passages taken together, viz. ver. 15, and ver. 18, instead of being a proof of his simple humanity, are exceedingly illustrative of his two natures. The shortest explanation I can give of this, will be in the words of a very learned writer on the Epistle, Clemens Streso; "*Hoc explicat Apostolus,*" says he, "*alio Verbo, quod priori addit, Christum nominans, ver. 18; Primogenitum ex mortuis. Hic iterum Filium proponit ut Primogenitum ut, ver. 15. Sed observanda est differentia in phrasi et constructione Verborum. Prius ipsum dixit Primogenitum omnis creaturæ vel creationis, hic dicit Primogenitum non mortuorum sed ex mortuis, et observandum, quod in priori ut genitus a creaturis plane et omni modo distinguatur; sed posteriori verborum constructione facile audire licet, quod mortuis jungatur, et in eorum numero ponatur: notandumque non dici ex morte, sed ex mortuis,*" p. 56.

reviewer of their own way of thinking says, "we are at a loss to see upon what principle of translation the Editors departed from Newcome's rendering of this passage. However thus much is obvious, that it was not through theological prepossession, for that would have directed them to retain the *common* rendering, since it points out the original source of that fulness of divine blessings which dwelt in Christ." I suppose this learned writer (whom I never wish to treat with disrespect, so liberal and candid is his style,) thought that this is implied by the term, "for it pleased *the Father*, &c.;" as to any theological prepossessions by which the translation might be influenced, I confess I think I find such in the Editors own note on the passage; for there we are told, that "the church is the fulness or the completion of the body of Christ, which God inhabits by his spirit communicated by Christ;" so that instead of all fulness having any relation to the Godhead, as seems manifestly to be the case from chap. ii. 9, which the Editors themselves render, "for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Deity bodily," the fulness here is, it seems, the church; and instead of our Lord being the person so gifted and distinguished, the Church is the ultimate object of the whole. Now surely some prepossession must have led them so to confound matters, for undoubtedly Christ is the prominent object in the passage as it stands in the Greek. True indeed it is, that the common rendering, and the Primate's version, point immediately to *the Father* as the original source of that πληρωμα of divine communications alluded to, and therefore the Editors have carefully retained *this*, though they have so much altered the sense of the rest of the passage; but as it happens, neither the received text, nor the Primate,

mate, nor the improved Version, nor the learned Reviewer, have any authority whatsoever for the insertion of this very term; "*the Father*" is not to be found *any where* in the Greek, no not in all Griesbach's various readings; there is some authority for the insertion of Θεότητος, which they omit, but none for "*the Father*," which they insert; the literal rendering of the Greek is, "for that in Him all *fulness* pleased to dwell," which is the very translation of the learned Hugh Broughton, as Mr. Granville Sharp has shown in his book on the Law of Nature. The Author of the Syriac Version, as translated by Ludovic. de Dieu has the same *literal* Version, "Quia in ipso voluit omnis plenitudo habitare," and the Arabic gives further support to us, except that instead of plenitudo, it would run, "Quia *perfectio* omnis in eo voluit habitare:" what this fulness was, has generally, (though in respect to this verse alone, I grant them, not universally) been held to signify "the fulness of the Godhead," το πληρωμα της Θεοτητος, Chap. ii. 9. The Editors object to the term Godhead because "it countenances, it seems, the strange notion of a God consisting of Three Persons;" their rendering therefore is, "For in Him dwelleth \* all the fulness of the *Deity bodily*," with which we shall not quarrel, for if this does not mean *substantially* and *personally*, our best Lexicographers greatly deceive us. It would appear therefore, that allowing for every thing that the *approved readings*, the *literal Version*, and the *chosen* and *select* terms of the *Editors* themselves would demand from us, the exact sense is, that in *Christ* all the fulness of the *Deity* pleased

\* Εὐδίκησεν καλοικησαι. Cyr. bis. See Griesbach.



to dwell, *σωματικως*, i. e. *substantially and personally*. See Leigh's Crit. Sacra; Wolfius and Suicer; Parkhurst, &c.

There is one thing I have further to notice. The learned Reviewer in the Monthly Repository intimates, that the 10th verse of the 2d Chapter of Colossians tends to prove, that the Apostle's disciples were filled with the *divine blessings*, exactly as Christ was. The term *πεπληρωμενοι* must be the only thing to justify such an opinion. For the passage does not in any manner say, that St. Paul's Colossian disciples were personally or bodily united to the fulness of the Deity, but that in or through Christ they were filled or perfected: *εν αυτω κατοικει παν το πληρωμα της Θεοτητος σωματικως*, is very different from *εγε εν αυτω πεπληρωμενοι*. It appears to me also, that there is as great a difference between *ινα πληρωθη εις παν το πληρωμα τς Θες*, Ephes. iii. 19, and the *in-dwelling* of the Godhead or Deity, *σωματικως*—*Θεοτης* and *το Θειον*, says Whitby, do never signify the gifts of God, or the doctrine of the Gospel, but the Divine Nature only. Nor can the will or revelation of God be said to dwell "*bodily*" in any person, Col. ii. 2: I notice this passage because Mr. Bryant in his Tract on Philo Judæus has laid great stress on it, as particularly in proof of the divinity of our Saviour; *εις επιγνωσιν τς μυστηρις τς Θες, και πατρος, και τς Χρις*, which he renders, "to the knowledge of the mystery of God, both of the Father and of the Christ," but Griesbach, and after him the Editors of the improved Version, omit the latter words, viz. "both of the Father and of the Christ," but upon very trifling authority; upon no authority comparatively that would justify its total expulsion from the text, while as it happens, among his various readings, Griesbach produces

duces some still more strongly in favour of Christ's divinity, as,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\ \tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\text{-}\chi\rho\iota\varsigma\epsilon\omicron$ ,  $\tau\epsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\ \delta\ \epsilon\varsigma\iota\ \chi\rho\iota\varsigma\omicron\varsigma$ — $\tau\epsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\ \chi\rho\iota\varsigma\epsilon\omicron$ .

Coloss. iii. 16. The Editors adopt Griesbach's emendation of  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron$  for  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ : "with psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs; singing with thankfulness, and *with* your hearts, to *God*." The received text has to *the Lord*. Here Griesbach's authorities are undoubtedly sufficient to support his amendment of the text, nor should I stop to notice it, but that Dr. Carpenter seems to think the correction sufficient to point out the meaning also of Ephes. v. 19; his words are as follow:—Col. iii. 16, *might be supposed* to show, that Christians were directed to sing hymns of grateful praise to Christ, but instead of, singing with thankfulness in your hearts to the Lord, Griesbach has '*to God*:'—Ephes. v. 19, 'Singing and making melody in your heart to *the Lord*' is certainly ambiguous, but as in the corresponding Epistle, I find the Christians directed to sing praises to *God*, it is reasonable to conclude that the Apostle meant the same here,'—Letters to Mr. Veysie, p. 228. I am almost tempted to say, that the passage in Ephesians so pointedly distinguishes our Lord as the object of the Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs there spoken of by the Apostle, as to explain the  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron$  of Griesbach's text, Coloss. iii. in our favour, certainly, however, whatever was the real purport of the Apostolic directions, I have the positive testimony both of friends and enemies to produce, that the hymns of the primitive Christians did express Christ's divinity. The Author of the  $\text{Μηνὰ Λαζαριδῶς}$ , written about the beginning of the third century, observes, that not only the ancients Fathers before him did speak of Christ as God, but that the hymns also  
penned

penned by Christians from the beginning, did set forth the divinity of Christ, the Logos; Ψαλμοὶ δεσποὶ καὶ ὠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑποπιζῶν γραφεῖσθαι τὸν Λόγον τῷ Θεῷ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνασι θεολογούντες, and the Epistle of Pliny to Trajan testifies the same; quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere.

---

WE might naturally expect to find some variation in the rendering of those passages, in which according to the received text, prayer and invocation appear to have been addressed to Christ. The phrase ἐπικαλεσμενοι τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. i, is of course rendered passively, but they appear to be not so particular about ἐπικαλεσμενοι τὸν Κύριον, 2 Tim. ii. 22; or ἐπικαλεσμενοι αὐτόν, Rom. x. 12; it seems therefore, that the question does not depend on this term, but that they are agreed that it *may* be applied actively; that it *may* signify *calling upon the name of Christ*, as well as calling upon the Lord, &c. I have often had occasion to observe, that the criticisms of these translators all tend to unsettle things and to settle nothing. In the first Chapter, ver. 2, of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, τοῖς ἐπικαλεσμενοῖς τὸ ὄνομα τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, is *inevitably* to be rendered, "to all, &c. that are called by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ\*."

And

\* To be called by the name of the Lord, or of any person, is not an uncommon phrase with the sacred writers, either of the Old or New Testament. In the former, the LXXII express

And in Acts xxii. 16, where Ananias is described as exhorting Paul "to arise and be baptized," *ἐπικαλίσταμενος τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου*, we must read it, it seems, "taking upon thyself his name;" yet in Rom. x. ver. 12, *πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλούμενους αὐτὸν* is rendered, all who call upon him, and ver. 13, *πᾶς γὰρ ὅς τις ἐπικαλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου*, is allowed to signify, "for whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord," and rightly enough certainly, for so the very same words signify in the septuagint translation of Joel ii. 32, to which the Apostle is supposed to have expressly referred. The fact is, to those who conceive our Saviour may be, and was, in those days invoked publicly, in prayer, no difficulty can occur; but to those who are unwilling to admit this, much pains need be taken to get fairly rid of many plain passages of Scripture. In the account given in the Acts of the Apostles, Chap. ix, of St. Paul's conversion, it is twice said of that holy Apostle, that he was a persecutor of all those who "called on the name of Jesus," *τοὺς ἐπικαλούμενους τὸ ὄνομα σου*, ver. 14, and again, *τοὺς ἐπικαλούμενους τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο*, ver. 21. One would imagine that these passages *must* be rendered *so*, because the same writer is the very person who tells us, that so far from being then called by the name of Christ, his disciples were actually *first* called so at Antioch \*,

some

press it thus as in Deut. xxviii. 10, and other places; *το ὄνομα σου ἐπικεκλήται ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*: in the New Testament we have the following instances; Luke i. 61, *ὅς καλεῖται τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ*.—Acts xv. 17, *ἐφ' ᾧ ἐπικεκλήται τὸ ὄνομα μου*.—James ii. 7, *τὸ κέλευθρον ὀνόματος ἐπικληθέν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*.

\* A learned writer in the Monthly Repository admits this, but would render the passage, "all who are called Disciples of Christ;" but we must know that for the disciples of Christ, either



some time subsequent to St. Paul's conversion; see Chap. xi. 26. The present Editors, however, are not alarmed at any anachronisms of this kind; deserting *Newcome*, they render both the passages above in the *technical phrase* of their own *systematic theology*, viz. "all who are called by thy name," ver. 14, and ver. 21, "those who call themselves after this name, &c." and yet in Chap. vii, they acknowledge that Stephen the Protomartyr died "*invoking*" Jesus \*, *ἐπικαλεσάμενον καὶ λεγούσα Κυρίε Ἰησὺ*, &c. these inconsistencies show the embarrassment they are under, and how difficult it is in superseding the technical phrases of one system, to reduce the original terms of Scripture to an exact agreement with those of another: but it must seem strange that persons, so jealous of allowing that the first disciples and converts to christianity

either generally or particularly, there is another term in Greek, so constantly used as to preclude the probability of such a periphrasis: but we are indeed oddly referred to Acts ix, to prove that *Luke* would have so described them, for that *πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλεσάμενους τὸ ὄνομα σου*, ver. 14, must be synonymous to *τοὺς μαθητάς τε Κυρίου*, ver. 2, whereas if the one is illustrative of the other, we might fairly adduce ver. 14, as a proof, that the Disciples of Christ did call on the name of Christ, and that the synonyme must have consisted in the custom by which his disciples were distinguished; a fact is assumed in this case also, which we deny, that no instance of prayer to Christ by his disciples could be known to Paul; St. Stephen's invocation, we contend, was a prayer, and we have so stated our opinion to be elsewhere. On the passage in Philippians ii, where it is said, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow," Archbishop Newcome observes, to bow the knee is to *pray*, referring us to Ephes. iii. 14, which is in fact referring us from St. Paul to St. Paul himself, who surely must be the best interpreter of his own thoughts and expressions.

\* The Editors have very properly not admitted the interpolated word, "God."

ever

ever called upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ as St. Paul is supposed to declare in the plainest terms, should ye not scruple to allow that Stephen invoked him in his dying moments in such emphatic terms, "LORD JESUS, receive my Spirit," and in the precise terms of a prayer, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge;" this then is provided for in a note annexed, to the following effect, "*this address of Stephen to Jesus, when he actually saw him, does not authorize us to offer prayers to Him, now he is invisible;*" this has long been acknowledged as the systematic decree and decision of the party; and therefore we have their leave (fully expressed in some of their publications,) to pray to our Saviour *under similar circumstances*, that is, if *ever we see him* in vision or in actual glory. But if he is either a false God, or mere man, how can the seeing him render him otherwise? And if he is true God, how can his being invisible render him less an object of prayer? must we not pray at all to the Supreme, because he is an *unseen* God? Peter, John, and James saw Christ in glory upon the Mount of Transfiguration; had they prayed to him *then*, it would evidently have been no crime; but if I mistake not, I have quite as good an authority for praying to the blessed Jesus when unseen as when seen; namely, the authority of the very same writer of the Acts of the Apostles, who records the prayer and invocation of Stephen. It seems almost impossible to suppose that the prayers of the Apostles, recited in the first Chapter, ver. 24, was not addressed to the blessed Jesus. I have the testimony of Woltzogenius on my side, who freely acknowledges it, nor can he deny the divinity of the attribute assigned him, καρδιονοῦσα παντων, which as

Grotius

Grotius says upon the place, "*Solius est Dei*\*, " an attribute expressly ascribed to him by his disciples, as a ground of their *faith*, "by THIS we know that thou CAMEST FORTH FROM GOD," and which Jesus, so far from correcting, received as a *proper* testimony of their faith, though by the *very knowledge he had of their hearts*, as the Evangelist goes on to relate, he foresaw they would soon be scattered and leave him alone; and "yet NOT ALONE, says the Saviour of the World, because THE FATHER is with me."

Any unprejudiced person would surely regard the address of Paul, 1 Thess. iii. 11, to be a joint prayer to the Father and Son in the Heaven of Heavens†. The Editors do not seem disposed to deny, that this is undoubtedly a prayer to Christ, but here they have recourse also to the supposition of his bodily presence to justify it; for we are cautioned in the notes not to think more of it than that "the Apostle in his missionary labours was under the immediate direction of Christ, who *occasionally appeared* to him for his guidance and encouragement." It would seem then that I ought to suppose that whenever I find such ejaculations, and addresses to the Lord Jesus Christ in the writings

\* "Thou, even Thou alone, knowest the hearts of the children of men:" 1 Kings viii. 39. Compare the following Texts spoken of the Son of God: John ii. 24, John xvi. 30, Acts i. 24, Rev. ii. 23.

† Dr. Carpenter, I see, in his last Work, pronounces it not to be a prayer: I do not wish to infer, that he is prejudiced to any greater degree than he supposes those to be prejudiced who see things differently from himself, which he often insinuates in his book.

of St. Paul\*, the Apostle at the moment had ocular demonstration of the presence of the Lord; if not so, he must sometimes have been addressed under exactly the same circumstances as his heavenly Father, *unseen* and *invisible*; and so to any plain understanding, it must appear to have been, from the whole tenor of these addresses, as well as of the benedictions and doxologies so frequent in the several Epistles. It would indeed particularly appear that no such discriminations were intended by the Apostle, from the very passage just referred to; for the bodily presence of our Saviour appears there to be particularly mentioned as an event future and remote. The whole passage is worth transcribing. "Now may our God and Father himself, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way to you; and may the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you; that he may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before our God and Father at the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints:" would any person suppose, that in order to sanction this address, the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ must have been in totally different circumstances; the one absent, the other *present*; the one unseen, the other *visible*; the one but occasionally the ob-

\* Dr. Carpenter in his Letters to Mr. Veysie, acknowledges that it appears clear to him that St. Paul, when he tells us, "he besought the Lord thrice," 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9, addressed his request to Christ; but he states three reasons for considering this to be "*plainly*" no precedent for prayer to Him. I solemnly declare, that not one of the three reasons appears to me to be even plausible. The actual presence of our Lord at the time, (though it must have been in vision,) is the first of the three reasons.



ject of prayer, and the other in real fact exclusively so; is it thus that the New Testament requires to be rendered generally intelligible? A New Version, it seems, is not necessary, for *here*, the Editors adopt every word of the received text; nothing is wanting, but that the public should be taught to put quite a new sense upon the same words; that they must be made to know, that a formal prayer to Christ jointly with God the Father, is no longer to be regarded as any authority to us to direct our prayers to him in the same manner; for though the Apostle totally forgot to tell us so in express terms, yet he certainly intended that *no such construction* should *ever* be put upon his words. And therefore we must be sure to understand *one* word, that he often uses, in *quite different senses*, in *different places*. That for instance, when he tells us, Rom. x. 12, 13, that the same Lord of all is rich, *εις παντας τις επικαλυμενους αυτον*, unto all who call upon him, for whosoever *επικαλεσηται το ονομα Κυρις*, shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be saved, we may safely regard it as a *characteristic* of the *true believer to call on the Lord*, or *on his name*; but that when he talks to the Corinthians in similar terms, and addresses his Epistle *πασι τοις επικαλυμενοις το ονομα τε Κυρις ημων Ιησυ Χριστω \**, we must *by no means* fancy that he intends to represent it to be the *characteristic of true believers to call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ*, (for that would be indeed the foulest idolatry,) but merely *to be called by the name of Christ*: indeed the Unitarians may well call St. Paul an inconclusive reasoner, (as they

\* Psalm cxvi. 13. "I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord," is thus rendered by the LXX, *ποτηριον σωτηριας λαβωμαι, και το ονομα Κυρις επικαλισομαι.*

sometimes do,) if this is his mode of communicating heavenly truths, for nothing can be more entirely ambiguous and uncertain; the reader, however, we hope will henceforth be able to discern, that it is not St. Paul himself who is the Author of all this confusion, but the Editors of this IMPROVED VERSION, with the aid of their extraordinary Notes, CRITICAL and EXPLANATORY.

In the Monthly Repository for May, 1809, is a long critique on this term. The writer inclines to adopt the passive signification, because the active would be contrary to *facts*, but he admits most fully that if the hypothesis is to be admitted, that the first Christians *did* call upon Jesus as an object of religious worship, then the active form would be a point in proof; and thus we are sent back to the previous question; and the term, at all events, proves nothing on the side of the Editors, against the common Version. The same learned writer very ingenuously confesses, that "as far as the customary scriptural use merely of precisely this phrase is concerned, the evidence decidedly favours the active or common rendering," and "that no instance appears in the Old Testament in which precisely this form of expression is used passively" so as to signify the being called by the name, &c.

There is one thing then I must observe before I conclude my Remarks on this subject. It seems clearly to appear, that the Unitarians would consider invocation and prayer under certain circumstances, to be proper evidences of Christ's Divinity. If so, surely it turns upon a nice point, namely, whether a particular word in a particular place is to be rendered actively or passively, either being admissible, and the active form most usual. The

learned Critic in the Monthly Repository, just cited, whose good temper and good manners, independent of his abilities, entitle him to every respect, however discordant our opinions, observes upon another occasion, that upon doubtful points, it ought to be considered, whether the Apostle could contradict himself in a point of the first magnitude, or err in a grammatical nicety. The question in this instance is not exactly of this nature, but it surely requires consideration also, whether a matter of such magnitude would have been left by the Apostle to the random determination of a grammatical nicety: he *could have expressed the being called by the name of Christ in other terms.*

---

THE behaviour of Thomas after the resurrection of our Saviour, has been so continually discussed by both parties, without coming to an agreement, that perhaps it never will be settled to their mutual satisfaction; as much as one side contends for his expressions, being a formal confession, the other insists upon their being no more than an exclamation: the present Editors of course support the latter opinion, though the context certainly helps to explain it otherwise, first in that his words are declared to be spoken in *answer to Christ*, and secondly inasmuch as our Saviour's own rejoinder implies, that it was a *confession of faith*: "Jesus saith unto him, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed." The Editors have but a very short note upon it, it is as follows: "these words are usually understood as a confession."

cession." Beza says, that they are an exclamation, q. d. "my Lord, and my God, how great is thy power!" Ephes. i. 19, 20. Whitby's last thoughts, 2d Edit. p. 78. Newcome. Here seem to be three authorities of no small repute, for regarding it as an exclamation. Dr. Whitby's *First Thoughts* are strongly in favour of the *confession*, if his *Second* thoughts are against it, and as to his reference to Beza, I must have leave to lengthen the note a little for them: it is exceedingly true, that Beza says it is an exclamation, and therefore he corrects the vulgate, and renders it in the vocative, "Domine mi et Deus mi," but observing that the context expressly says, they were spoken *αὐτῷ*, to *Him*, that is, *Christ*, he says, "hæc igitur verba quæ sequuntur non sunt tantum Admirantis Thomæ, ut *hunc locum eludebant Nestoriani*, sed ipsum illum Jesum ut verum Deum ac Dominum suum compellantis. Male igitur vulgate interpretatur hunc locum, recto casu *Dominus meus et Deus meus*; nec alius est locus in his libris Expressior, de Christo, ut VERO DEO invocando." This is what I find in Beza concerning this exclamation. It was, he says, *non tantum*, not merely an exclamation, but an actual address of Thomas to *Jesus*, calling him both his *Lord* and his *God*; an indisputable precedent for the invoking Christ, "ut *Deus verus*," as the true God. I shall venture to lay it down as a rule for all readers of this New Version to examine the references. I have had occasion to notice this before in respect to the references I made to Dr. Lardner, and this to Beza is somewhat of the same nature. The learned Primate whom they make their model, is often made to bear direct testimony against himself; some instances of which I have pointed out.

1 Tim.



1 Tim. iii. 16.—1 John v. 7.

IT is particularly my intention to say but little upon these two passages, because so very much has been said by others, and I have made remarks upon them in my introduction. The subject is fully discussed in the *Eclectic Review*, for March, 1809. The strong testimony of *Matthæi* to the reading of Θεός in the former passage, has lately been noticed in the *Brit. Crit.* see Vol. xxxiv. 387. The evidence of *Chrysostom*, *Cyril*, and *Theodoret*, is to be seen in *Pearson* on the Creed, fol. Edit. p. 128; the notes there deserve to be examined as applicable to other parts of this Tract. I lament having been totally unable to consult a Treatise highly commended by Mr. Sharp; I mean Dr. *Velthuisen's* Observations. The Editors discard Θεός, and as they decidedly adopt the reading of ΟΣ, the third reading, ὁ φανερωθη, need not be noticed here. I would only observe, that by rendering os, "He who," they deprive us of one relation it has been supposed to bear, and in which sense it would fairly restore to us the word Θεός, which would become its regular antecedent. Professor *Cramer* adopts this construction of the passage; see *Eclectic Review*: many doubts seem to exist as to the grammatical propriety of the rendering adopted by the Editors, but I must acknowledge that an *Unitarian* writer in the *Theological Repository*, for May, 1809, who signs himself, *Primitiveus*, has produced so many strong passages from Scripture in favour of the definite signification of the relative pronoun, that I cannot but agree with him. Dr.  
Car-

Carpenter commends this writer in his Letters to Mr. Veysie, with great reason, as I think, and repeats his references. But if *or* be here used definitely, yet the passage relates to Christ, and I am therefore fully satisfied to explain it, by such other parts of Scripture as apply particularly to our Lord, especially in the writings of St. John, who so expressly describes the *manifestation in the flesh*\*, of the divine *Logos*. The *Word*, says St. John, was *made flesh*, (or *became* flesh, or *was* flesh, which latter the Editors prefer, but which I think makes no difference,) and *dwelt among us*, 1 John i. 14; and we have seen *his glory*—*ἐφανερώθη*, *He*, was *manifested*, 1 John iii. 5, 8, iv. 2, and *came in the flesh*, who was the Son of GOD, the Word, the Angel of the Covenant, &c. Whitby has well

\* This *manifestation in the flesh*, appears to the Editors to imply no more than that Christ was “a real man, and proper human Being,” against the *Gnostics* and *Docetæ*. But surely it was a most awkward way of showing against the *Docetæ*, that a mere man was actually a man, to say he was *manifested in the flesh*; and against the *Gnostics*, just as awkward a way of proving, that the person appearing as man, was not united to a *super-angelic Being*; we must suppose them saying to the latter, Jesus Christ was not as you suppose, a *super-angelic Being* united to a man at his baptism, (see Carpenter’s Letters to Veysie, 93,) but a mere man like yourselves, *manifested in the flesh*: and to the *Docetæ*, Jesus Christ was not as you think, a *super-angelic Being* that assumed only the appearance of a human body, but actually a perfect man, *manifested in the flesh*, which expression all the while is really the fittest that could have been applied to intimate what both believed, viz. that the human body of Jesus, either actually or in appearance, was assumed for particular purposes, by a superior Being. Dr. C. allows that Rom. viii. 3, admits of a convenient interpretation on the pre-existent scheme, and the expression, viz. “in the likeness of sinful flesh,” more countenances the opinion of the Gnostic christians, that Christ was a man of appearance only. See his Letters, p. 239.

shown

shown by such a reference to parallel passages how necessary it is to conclude our Saviour to be the subject of the terms used, and if so, the proof of his divinity depends on many other texts, besides the one before us, which is certainly the case also with the other passage, 1 John v. 7, which I confess I had much rather resign at once than be supposed to *rest* my faith upon it; and I should hope that I have advanced enough already to show that the rejection of the passage by the present Editors does not, in my opinion at least, leave the doctrine it is supposed to contain *at all* defenceless; but that the substance of it is to be found elsewhere, to the sufficient proof of there being THREE that *bear record in Heaven*, the FATHER, the WORD, and the HOLY SPIRIT, and that these THREE are ONE: see Jones's Cath. Doctr. of the Trinity. The note, upon the probable spuriousness of the text is fair and candid; the weight of the external evidence against it, is undoubtedly, *in the present state of things*, so strong, that the Editors could not have been expected to admit it. They reject it, however, without any indecent expressions of triumph, and I shall not go out of my way to defend it, as though they had done us any serious injury. I shall only observe, that I cannot help still entertaining a suspicion, as well as the learned Reviewer of Dr. *White's* Greek Testament: see *Brit. Crit.* Vol. xxxiv, p. 387, that the controversy is not yet completely closed, though I have no opportunity of consulting the works there cited.

MATT.

MATT. vi. 13 \*. The Doxology here omitted should rather have been marked as doubtful. There is certainly much evidence to be produced against it, but the testimony in its favour is strong and particularly respectable; *Porson* observes, that it is found in all the Greek MSS. except eight; in two of the oldest Latin copies; in some MSS. of the *Arabic* and *Persic*; in the *Syriac*, the *Armenian*, the *Gothic*, and the *Æthiopic*: see his *Letters to Travis*. *Wells* refuses to reject it, and very judiciously includes it only in brackets as questionable; reasons may be assigned for its omission in *Origen*, *Gregory Nysen*, and *Cyril*, because they probably undertook only to expound the *petitionary* part of the prayer as part of the *public* Liturgies, while the Doxology was reserved for the *Priest* alone. There is an internal evidence in its favour that deserves to be noticed. It is generally allowed that our Saviour composed his prayer from Jewish forms. Now in those forms the Doxology occurs, *Trevels*, in his *Critical Examination*, supports its genuineness, particularly from the above circumstance, and *Lightfoot* in his *Horæ Hebraicæ* dwells upon it, remarking, that the *insertion* of the Doxology in Matthew, and omission of it in Luke, seems to infer that the one was given as a public, the other as a private form of prayer; and what he says of the Doxology applies also to the Amen; in both cases indeed the Doxology was usually a part of

\* These Remarks having been sent to the Press in separate parcels, and at different times, the Author hopes it will be admitted as an excuse for the irregular manner in which they must appear to be given to the public.



their prayers, but in public it was openly rehearsed, in private, *tacitè, voce submisissimà*: his words are, *Habes ergo in Coronide (Doxologia) signum publici usûs, ex consonantia ejus ad Antiphonum in Templo, et privati, ex consonantia ejus ad ejaculationem in precibus Phylactericis. Signum publici usûs in adjunctione, Amen; signum privati in ejus absentia; signum utriusque in conformitate totius ad consuetudinem gentis.* The Editors have certainly the authority of *Mill* and *Griesbach* for its rejection from the text, but what applies to the Editors, applies to the latter also, a total rejection seems scarcely justifiable in any instance. *Twells* and *Whitby* defend the passage against *Mill*, and it may still be reasonably defended against *Griesbach's* counter-authorities. *Newcome* very strangely omits it without even a note of explanation.

---

JOHN xvii. 11. 'Ous δέδωκας μοι. The Editors adopt the reading  $\wp$  instead of 'Ous, for which emendation there are undoubtedly abundant and great authorities; yet the common reading is evidently the most plain and intelligible. If, however,  $\wp$  is preferable, it is rather a point gained than lost to the orthodox. The *ονομα τῆ Θεῆς*, given to Christ by God, is a term of peculiar import, and must needs include attributes of the Almighty, wholly incommunicable to any finite being; if  $\wp$  is the true reading, it tends to explain 3 John, 6, 7.

## HEBREWS.

AT the foot of this Epistle, doubts are expressed as to the actual author of it. It is peremptorily said to contain "far-fetched analogies and inaccurate reasonings," so that it seems, it would be with no small loss of fame, that it could be ascribed to any Apostle: but I always observe, that those who regard not our Lord's death as a proper sacrifice and atonement, have particular objections to this part of Scripture. "By whom it was written they say, is uncertain. *Origen* says, that no one can tell who was the *author* of it. It has been ascribed to Paul, to Barnabas, to Luke, and to Timothy: but if *Origen*, the most learned and inquisitive writer in the third century, could not discover the *author*, it is in vain for us to attempt it, and we must be content to remain in *ignorance*." Now there must be allowed to be a possibility of some ambiguity in the terms *written* and *author*; and such an ambiguity seems to have led to a misunderstanding of *Origen's* real sentiments. This Author rather gives it to *Paul*; nay does so in almost express terms, though he certainly says, as they state, that "by whom it was written is uncertain," or rather as a learned critic renders it, "but who penned the Epistle, God only certainly knows." *Origen* pronounces of it, that it contains τα μεν νοηματα τῆς Αποστολῆς, "the sentiments of the Apostle, (i. e. of St. Paul,) but the phrase and turn of style, seem to be that of some one who committed to memory, τα εισημενα ὑπο τῆς διδασκαλῆς, the words of the Master. Therefore, says he, whatever Church holds this Epistle to be St. Paul's, is to be commended on that

that account, αὐτὴν εὐδοκίμειτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ for, he adds, it was *not without cause*, καὶ γὰρ εἰκὴ, that the antients handed it down as Paul's; and then follows, but who wrote it, τις δὲ ὁ γράψας, &c. that is surely who *penned it*, as the critic referred to, (*Twells*) suggests; that this was *Origen's* real opinion seems most likely from his Epistle to *Africanus*, cited by *Mill*, in which he expressly avows it to be his intention to publish a dissertation in case of necessity, εἰς ἀποδείξιν τῆς εἶναι παύλας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, actually to demonstrate that this Epistle is Paul's; he certainly also in many of his works cites the Epistle under the name of Paul. As the above expressions of Origen are taken from Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, and the Editors urge nothing against the canonical authority of this Epistle, beyond the distinctions insisted upon by that ancient historian: I shall not enter further into the main question. Archbishop Newcome places the following words of Erasmus at the head of his notes:

“Optime Lector, nihilo minoris velim esse tibi hanc Epistolam, quod a multis dubitatum sit Pauli essit an alterius. Certè cujuscunque est, multis nominibus digna est quæ legatur à Christianis: et ut a *Stylo Pauli*, quod ad *Phrasim* attinet, longè latèque *discrepat*, ita ad *Spiritum* et *Pectus Paulinum* vehementer *accedit*.”

---

I COR. xv. 47. The first Man *was* from the ground, earthy, the second man *will be* from heaven, [heavenly].

This

This is the improved reading of this celebrated passage, and I find it strongly defended by Dr. Carpenter in his Letters to Mr. *Veysie*. They seem to have authority for the omission of *Kυριος*\*, though *Griesbach* does not discard it from his text, and the *verbs* introduced have the sanction of *Newcome*. It is to the latter that I chiefly object. I have read Dr. Carpenter's remarks with great attention, but I cannot feel reconciled to the emendation proposed: he begins his remarks by a reference to ver. 21, for since by *man* came death, by *man* also cometh the resurrection of the dead, and this he says so plainly implies, that Jesus was properly a human Being, that if he had not been called *man*, he sees not how it could fairly be interpreted to refer to a superior nature. Now I must declare that it has always appeared to me, that there is a great emphasis in the term *since*, *πεισθη*, and though it may perhaps have arisen from prejudice, that is, from certain preconceptions with regard to general doctrines, yet so it is, that I have ever regarded it as introduced to account for our Lord's assumption of the manhood. "For since by *man* came death, by *man* also cometh, &c." did Christ then as *man* raise himself from the dead? and yet he is the First Fruits. Why could not God raise the dead without the intervention of the *second man*? Why lay such stress upon the comparison, unless the *manhood* of Jesus was singular and extraordinary, and connected with some particular ends of providence? Now it seems to me, that the exact force of the first comparison, ver. 21, and of the introductory causal conjunction, *πεισθη*, is shown and illustrated by the

\* The learned and impartial *Wells* long ago rejected it.



expressions, ver. 47. The first Man, that is, Adam, *is*, or *was* from the earth, earthy, the second man; *is*, or *was* from heaven, or the Lord from heaven. The first man was miraculously formed from the earth, and therefore earthy, but the second, who is to give life to those on whom the first entailed death, was not formed miraculously from the earth, but came into the world miraculously from heaven. I may be wrong, but such have been long the impressions made upon my mind by the passages in question. Why the second *inserted* verb should of necessity have a future force, I cannot comprehend; it is alleged indeed that ver. 22, ver. 48, and ver. 49, point this out so plainly as to be an irresistible proof of it: but surely our own resurrection through Christ may be future, and yet be as closely and intimately connected with the *first* advent of our blessed Lord, as with his final coming to judge the world. *Our own* death must as long as we live be future, yet surely we owe it to the first man who *was* from the earth, earthy, why then may we not be dependent for a future resurrection on the second *Man*, who *was* or who *is* from heaven, heavenly? I confess I am too dull to discern the necessity that is said to arise from the construction of verse 49, for the future force given to the last of the inserted verbs, ver. 47. I even think the circumstances of the case, upon which Dr. Carpenter dwells, strictly require, that it should have a past or present force; to show what our Lord *is* and *was* in regard to his original nature, comparatively with the nature and original of the first man, Adam. The *assumption* of the *manhood* by a pre-existent being is *the point* generally overlooked. Thus Dr. C., who commonly writes like a sensible man, and no doubt is sincere, uses an argument

gument on Heb. ii. 14—18, that seems to me to border upon absurdity: he thinks our Saviour's *mere* manhood asserted in the strongest terms by the Apostle, where he says, that since the children are partakers of flesh and blood, the Son also *partook* of the same, "for verily he helpeth not Angels, but he helpeth the seed of Abraham, *wherefore* it becometh him to be like his brethren in all things;" but what a strange conceit it must be to talk of a mere man helping Angels, or to draw such a comparison, if the same Being could not, if he had chosen it, have passed over the seed of Abraham, and assisted Angels.

JOHN i. 14. I have had occasion to make remarks before on the term *μονογενής*, to which the Editors object: see p. 104.] The note they have upon this passage I am induced to transcribe, in order to show, that their remarks are in no manner novel, but were in fact advanced and most circumstantially replied to, so long ago as in the year 1731.

[Chap. i. 15. *As of the only Son.*] Only-begotten N. This expression does *not* refer to any *peculiar mode of derivation of existence*, but is used to express *merely* a higher degree of affection. It is applied to *Isaac*, Heb. xi. 17, though Abraham had others sons. The same word in the Hebrew is translated *indifferently*, *μονογενής* and *αγαπῆτος*. This word is applied to Christ by the Evangelist *John*,  
four

four times in the Gospel, and once in his Epistle; and by no other writer of the New Testament. In the Epistle to the Hebrews it *unquestionably* signifies beloved, or most beloved; and in this sense it is used by John, Chap. i. 14, 18, iii. 16, 18, 1 John iv. 9; "He seems to adopt it," says Mr. Lindsey, "on all occasions, where the other sacred writers would have said *αγαπητός*:" compare Matt. iii. 17, xvi. 5, Mark i. 11, ix. 7, xii. 6, Luke iii. 22, ix. 35; see *Cappe*, ib. p. 94, and *Grotius* in loc.

This is the note of the Editors. (Dr. Carpenter has a note to the same effect in his Letters to Mr. Veysie.) I shall now transcribe the remarks of Dr. Twells, which happen to occur in his critical examination of the new Text and Version of the New Testament, which appeared 1729.

"Upon John i. 14, the Annotator observes, that the word "*only begotten*," as here applied, conveys no *idea* to the mind, which is false; for it naturally conveys to the mind an *idea* of a *person*, who is the *Son* of the *father* in a *peculiar* sense. He further tells us, that the correspondent Hebrew word, *Ichid*, is rendered by the LXX, *αγαπητός*, *beloved*, intimating that *μονογενής*, John i. 14, means no more than *beloved*, and therefore conveys no *idea* to the mind, of *Christ's* having a *peculiar* sonship; but herein he is certainly mistaken. For though *αγαπητός* literally signifies *beloved*, yet when it is spoken of a *Son*, it *frequently* or rather *generally* stands for *only-begotten*. For the truth of this, appeal may be made to *Lexicographers* and to *Scholiasts*. Suidas expounds *αγαπητός*, by το *μονογενής*. Hesychius, who is the standard of *Hellenistic* language, gives *μονογενής* as the prime equipollent expression to *αγαπητός*. *Julius Pollux*, lib. 3. c. 2. says,

says, that an *only* son of his father or mother, is called υἱὸς ἀγαπητός; and that *Hesiod* calls an *only* daughter, θυγατὴρ ἀγαπητή. Again; when *Homer* calls *Astyanax*, the son of *Hector*, Εὐτοριδὴν ἀγαπήλον, Il. z. ver. 401, the Scholiast explains ἀγαπήλον by μονογενή. *Xenophon* and *Plutarch* so use the word: and *Aristotle*, *Rhet.* i, ventures to call the *one* eye of a person, ὀφθαλμὸν ἀγαπήλον. Hence also probably it was, that the *latin* Version used by *Cyprian*, l. 3. Test. c. 15, gives us *Unicum*, for ἀγαπήλον of the LXX, Gen. xxii. 2. For so they there render *Ichid*, though our Author erroneously gives us ἀγαπήλον in that place, as the rendering of *Aquila*, who really translates *Ichid*, μονογενή, as *Symmachus* does μονόν. He concludes his observation thus: "These two significations are promiscuously used by the *Jewish* and *Greek* writers. But though *Greek* writers express *only* or *only begotten* by *beloved*, as has been abundantly shown: yet that either *Ichid* in *Hebrew*, or μονογενής in *Greek*, ever stands merely for *beloved*, no proof has yet been given. *Grotius's* instances in *Isaac* and *Solomon* are short of the purpose: for *Isaac* was the only son of *Abraham* by *Sarah*; and *Solomon*, Prov. iv. 3, is said to be *Ichid*, LXX, ἀγαπώμενος, of his mother, not of his father, and he was really *Bathsheba's* only surviving son. As to the instance of 1 Chron. xxix. 1, where *Grotius* supposes *David* calls *Solomon* his *only* son, there the *Hebrew* is *Achad*, not *Ichid*. But the LXX never render *Achad* μονός or μονογενής: and here it has rather the force of ἐλάχιστος, *preferably* to all the rest. The *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions express *Achad* to the same effect, and our own Version supposes such a sense. We have therefore reason to believe, that when *St. John* calls *Christ* the *only* begotten of the Father, he designed



to convey to the minds of his readers, an idea of the Son's original; that he was the Son of God in a peculiar sense, naturally, and therefore eternally begotten. *Grotius* was so little satisfied with the other account of this expression, given in the *note* as the only one; that he thinks ours may also be added to it; he contends that *Christ* is rightly called *μονογενής*, both because he is the Father's best beloved Son, and *also* because he proceeded from him after a *peculiar* manner."

I have thought this long note worth transcribing, not only as a fair and circumstantial reply to the annotation of the Editors, but as a proof, that there is nothing new in their objections. Leigh's *Critica Sacra*, under the term *αγαπῆλος*, is quite as strong to the purpose, and that carries us back to the year 1646; so that, in fact, 164 years ago, we may venture to conclude, that no truly learned man could have ventured to publish such a note, as the Editors have now given us upon John i. 14, as though it were quite a new discovery in criticism, not thought of (except perhaps by *Grotius*, who denies the inference they would draw from it,) till Mr. Lindsey and Mr. Cappe, in our own days, happily hit upon it. It is the more necessary to dwell upon this, because the present Editors deny, or at least show themselves disposed to deny, not only the *ante-mundane filiation* of the Logos, but his miraculous conception; doubts have heretofore arisen among learned Trinitarians themselves, whether *μονογενής* applies in this place to the *divinity* or *humanity* of the son, but as to the peculiarity and singularity of his origin in *either* sense they are perfectly agreed. Bishop Bull's vth chapter of his *Judicium Eccles. Cathol.* upon this subject, demands the attention of every Theologian. *Parkhurst*  
refers

refers the term to his humanity, as Dr. Carpenter has noticed; *πρωτοτοκος* is a term, the sense of which as applied to our Saviour is also continually misrepresented, as I have had occasion to show elsewhere: see Brit. Crit. vol. xviii. 625.

---

HEBREWS i. 8. Though I must confess that I think this passage scarcely needs to be defended from the Socinian glosses, yet the learned Author above cited, in his vindication of it, produces a parallel passage from the book of *Lamentations*, that I shall here introduce, as tending in my opinion, to corroborate the propriety of the received Version. The Greek of the LXX is ΣΥ ΔΕ ΚΥΡΙΕ (vocative of course, in the Heb. JEHOVAH) ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΑΙΩΝΑ ΚΑΤΟΙΚΗΣΕΙΣ, ὁ ΘΡΟΝΟΣ ΣΑ ΕΙΣ ΓΕΝΕΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΓΕΝΕΑΝ. Mr. Middleton, in his late work on the Doctrine of the Greek Article, very properly concludes his note with observing, that *Eusebius* in his *Dem. Evang.* has for ὁ Θεός, quoted ὁ Θεέ, and that *Wetstein*, whose bias is elsewhere sufficiently manifest, candidly admits, at ver. 9, that ὁ Θεός is here the vocative, and that the writer has called Christ by the name of God. I am glad to see that since the publication of his discourse before the Unitarian Society, June, 1808, Dr. Carpenter has seen reason to admit, that the idiom of the Greek *forbids* our rendering it “God is thy throne;” which in his discourse he had selected as one among the most important *improved* renderings: he very candidly, therefore, desires his

former remarks to be expunged. Letters to Mr. Veysie, Introd. p. xi. He at the same time, however, contends for the *lower* sense of *Elohim*, as applied to Solomon, Ps. xlv; but we are still at issue, as to the application of that term, to *the Son of God*, the *Logos*.

1 TIM. iv. 10. Οτι ηλπικαμεν επι ΘΕΩ ΖΩΝΤΙ,  
 ὃς ἐστι ΣΩΤΗΡ παντων ανθρωπων.

The Editors render this, "Because we trust in the living God, who is a *preserver* of all men, but especially of those who believe." Newcome has, "*the Saviour* of all men," and though *preserver* is not altogether objectionable in this place, as included in the term Σωτηρ, yet the latter clause of the verse seems to require *Saviour*. *Erasmus* has *Servator*; *Beza*, *Conservator*; *Whitby* contends, that *eternal salvation* must have been in the view of the Apostle, as well as *temporal protection*; compare ver. 8, and Chap. ii. 4, where the Editors very properly have "GOD our SAVIOUR:" *Doddridge* in his paraphrase has both terms. I shall venture to make some remarks on the expression in general: "the *Living God*, who is the Σωτηρ, or *Saviour* of all men;" a term, which though it may include under it that of temporal protection and preservation, is, as *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra* shows, a scriptural expression of singular importance. My remarks will be somewhat irregular, but yet by no means I trust unconnected.

There

There are no two passages in the New Testament more contested than Acts xx. 28, and 1 Tim. iii. 16. The difficulty in the first, relates to that *Church*, (Εκκλησια) which *Christ* “*purchased with his own blood.*” It is doubted whether it *could* be called ἡ Εκκλησια τῶ Θεοῦ,—the church of *God*; for though the stress is laid upon αἱματος ἰδίου, this comes to the same thing; authorities are ransacked, and it is determined, that of the several various readings discovered, viz. the Church, τῶ Χριστῶ, of *Christ*—τῶ Θεῶ, of *God*—Κυρίου Θεοῦ, the *Lord God*—Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου, the *God and Lord*—Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, the *Lord and God*—and Κυρίου, the *Lord*; St. Luke in all likelihood wrote the latter:—let this be so.

In 1 Tim. iii. 16, it is doubted, whether the Apostle could have written, “*GOD* was manifested in the flesh;” here, however, the Apostle is undoubtedly speaking of a mystery immediately connected with the *Church*, (Εκκλησια) Θεοῦ ζώντος, “of the *living God.*”

In the passage before us, 1 Tim. iv. 10, the Θεὸς ζῶν, or *living God*, is plainly called σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, generally rendered, the SAVIOUR of all men: But is not *Christ* then the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe? Was *he* not *manifested in the flesh*, so to be \*; to redeem his

\* This must be attended to, for I do not wish to fall into the error, we are cautioned against by the *Eclectic Reviewers*, in the words of *Athanasius*; I do not at all intend to intimate, that the blood of God can be spoken of, διχα σαρκος, separate from the assumed humanity: see *Eclectic Review*, for March, 471. I have it not in my power to read the treatise of *Athanasius*, which they recommend; but I must honestly declare, I do not see the danger they allude to, in so strong a light as they seem to do. Certain *hymn writers* I grant in some instances have ventured upon expressions, not altogether to be justified, but it is a nice point to determine at all times between the *unio hypostatica* and *communicatio idiomatum*.



church, that is, through *his own blood*? True it is, indeed, the Unitarians refuse to acknowledge that he could ever be called by St. Paul, "Our great God and Saviour," Titus ii. 13; but yet they will allow, that σωτηρος ἡμῶν in this very passage belongs to Christ, though the σωτηρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων is said, 1 Tim. iv, to be the *living God*. If then I attempt not to deny the preponderating weight of *existing* and *known* authorities to be in favour of the readings adopted by Griesbach and the Editors of the improved Version; Acts xx. 28, and 1 Tim. iii. 16. Still my opinion is, that "the *living God* was the *Saviour* of all men:" 1 Tim. iv. 10. That he was "*manifested in the flesh*" for this purpose, 1 Tim. iii. 16. That he thus redeemed his Church—*δια τῆς αἱματός ἰδίας*. HIS Church, namely, ἡ Ἐκκλησία τῆς Θεοῦ; (if not Acts xx. 28, yet) 1 Tim. iii. 5. Ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζώντος: 1 Tim. iii. 15. Θεοῦ ζώντος σωτηρος πάντων ἀνθρώπων: 1 Tim. iv. 10. *That Church* which Christ himself so emphatically calls MY Church, Matth. xvi. 18.

Mr. *Lindsey*, the Editors tell us, has observed, that the sacred writers were not very exact in the application of the terms "*Lord*," "*Saviour*," and the like, which they *indifferently* gave both to *God* and *Christ*. This *indifference* was certainly very extraordinary, in writers, who have occasionally applied the same terms *exclusively*, and with a marked and peculiar emphasis. Thus 1 Cor. viii. 6, as there is ONE God, so is it declared, there is ONE *Lord* Jesus Christ\*." In Isaiah

\* The comment of *Jerome* upon this, is as follows: Si enim ut existimant Ariani, Deus pater solus est Deus, eâdem consequentiâ, solus erit Dominus Jesus Christus et nec Pater erit Dominus

xliii. 11, it is recorded as the declaration of JEHOVAH: "I am the *Lord*, beside me there is NO SAVIOUR," Ch. xlv. 21; a just GOD, and a SAVIOUR, there is none beside me." In Hosea xiii. 4, "There is no SAVIOUR beside me:" and yet, John iv. 42, we read, "this is the Christ, THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD;" Tit. i. 3. St. Paul wishes peace to Titus "from the LORD JESUS Christ OUR SAVIOUR:" see also Ch. iii. 6. And 1 John i. 14, we are expressly told, that "the FATHER sent the SON to be the SAVIOUR of the WORLD:" compare Rev. vii. 10. In short, these terms are so applied by Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles, that I must freely declare, that the only *indifference* they seem to me to show, is corroborative in the highest degree, of *that* opinion which tends to identify the attributes of *the Christ* and "the *living God, the Saviour of all men,*" and to prove this point I should be content merely to appeal to the Epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus: for instance: In that to Titus, he speaks of the appearance, (ἐπιφανειαν) της δοξης τῆς μεγάλης Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—"of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." as it *may* be literally rendered; to say no more at present. In the second Epistle to Timothy, the same Apostle speaks of the appearance, (ἐπιφανειαν) τῆς Σωτηρίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—"of our SAVIOUR Jesus Christ:" and in the sixth Chapter of the first Epistle, of the appearance (ἐπιφανειαν) of our LORD Jesus Christ; which in *his* time *he* shall show, who is the KING of KINGS and LORD of LORDS; the very title given to the

Dominus nec filius Deus; sed absit, ut non sit, vel in Dominatione Deitas, vel in Deitate Dominatio, Unus est Dominus, et unus est Deus; quia patris et filii dominatio, una Divinitas est. *Hicrom. Comment. in Ephes. iv. 5.*

WORD or *Logos* of God: Rev. xix. 16. Again; 2 Tim. iv. 1, we have “the appearance (*επιφανεῖαν*) of the LORD Jesus Christ and his kingdom:” see also ver. 8. But Titus ii. 11—13, taken all together, is very strong to the purpose,—for there are *two* appearances \* in reality spoken of. One appearance which is to be the happy end of our hope: and another *appearance*, ver. 11, which *hath* already taken place. “When, ἡ Χρῆς τῆς Θεῆς, —the grace of God, (the Editors render it *favour*, but grace is unexceptionably better,) appeared to all men, *teaching* us that we should live soberly, &c.: *Newcome’s* margin, indeed, gives us instead of grace or favour, the “gracious Gospel;” but how this gracious Gospel was manifested, except by the personal appearance of our Saviour Jesus, it would be hard to show, considering that this *first appearance* seems to be actually so explained, ver. 14, “Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works:” compare Titus iii. 4—7.: and it must be farther remembered, that the saving doctrine spoken of, ver. 11, 12, is expressly said to be, ver. 10; the doctrine, τῆς Σωτηρίας ἡμῶν Θεῆς—of GOD our SAVIOUR. In 1 Tim. vi. 1, we read, “that the name of the *Lord* and *his* doctrine be not blasphemed:” here Griesbach reads the name, &c. of God, Θεῆς; and yet ver. 3, serves to show, *that* the doctrine spoken of was particularly the doctrine, τῆς Κυρίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In 1 Titus i. 3, we have τῆς Σωτηρίας ἡμῶν Θεῆς; and in the very next verse, τῆς Κυρίας Χριστοῦ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν. Surely St. Paul must have been indifferent about the use

\* See Cyril. Catech. 15, cited by Mr. Wordsworth, p. 69, and Chrysostom, pp. 76, 78.

of these terms to a degree of stupidity, if believing Jesus to be a mere man, he neither thought the term Θεός, or the term Σωτήρ, *personally* applicable to him. But again; we have above, “the *appearance of the glory* of the great God;” Titus ii. 13: and in the first Chapter of the first Epistle to Timothy, ver. 11, we read of the “*Gospel of the Glory* of the blessed God;” but that by this was intended the Gospel of *Christ*, the very next verse will shew.

The Doxology, 1 Tim. i. 17, is addressed τῷ βασιλεὶ τῶν αἰώνων. And the Unitarians themselves insist upon it, that διὰ καὶ τῆς Αἰῶνος ἐποίησεν, Heb. i. 2, means the ages or dispensations constituted *for Christ*. If it be so, then the βασιλεὺς τῶν Αἰώνων, 1 Tim. i. 17, is also said to be the *μονὸς Θεός*, in the very same place\*. Lastly: 1 Tim. iv. 8, 10, where it is said, “We trust in the living God, the *Saviour* of all men;” it is introduced with the remark, “this is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance:” now the same introduction occurs, 1 Tim. i. 15, to the remark, that “Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.”

There is one thing I am bound to notice. Dr. Carpenter thinks St. Paul’s language is to be cautiously received; he, it seems, had an *extraordinary intercourse* with our *Saviour*, and *language founded on such peculiar communications* cannot with *any propriety* be now used by Christians, unless indeed it can be shown from the Scriptures, that the Lord Jesus still *personally* presides over and regulates the affairs of his Church, and still in a *secret* manner

\* That the *Angel of the Covenant* was the true βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων in Jewish Phrascology, see Ben Mordecai’s Letter, ii. 37; see also Mr. Bennet on the Melec Olam. Olam. Hane-shamoth, Ch. iii.



*personally* influences the minds of his faithful disciples. I have partly replied to this already; but I cannot help observing the drift of Dr. C.'s arguments in general; he asks in one place, whether the three Gospels of *Matthew, Mark* and *Luke*, with the *Acts of the Apostles*, could be considered as inculcating the divinity of Christ *independent* of the Gospel of *St. John*. I should say they certainly would, even after a most careful perusal of all Dr. C.'s arguments to the contrary; but at all events, the Gospel of *St. John* is an essential portion of the Canon, and therefore what *he* teaches, whether in supply of former deficiencies, or as new matter entirely, is as much to be believed, as any undisputed parts of the other Gospels; so what *St. Paul* inculcates, must be received as an essential part of the Canon; his *peculiar* communications are to be considered, exactly upon the footing of all other communications. If *he* had any clearer revelations of the exalted dignity of our Redeemer than the other Apostles, he is quite as much entitled to be the standard of our opinions, as Peter, or John, or any other of the sacred writers. If our Saviour *personally* influenced the mind of *St. Paul*, I conceive he might just as easily *personally* influence the minds of all other his faithful disciples, and that he is likely to do so, expected to do so, and believed to do so, I collect from the avowed opinions of all sects and denominations of Christians, except that particular class to which Dr. C. belongs, (not but that Dr. C. himself declines asserting the contrary) that he *will* do so, I collect from his own express declarations.

HEBREWS i. ver. 11, 12. I find in Wells's edition of the Greek text, two emendations in these verses, which though not of much importance, yet I think even *Griesbach*, but certainly *Newcome* and the present Editors, might reasonably have adopted, though the weight of authority from MSS. and versions might appear against them; one of them indeed, I must say the Editors *do* adopt; I notice them however more than any thing to show the great attention which almost a century ago, Dr. *Wells* paid to the correction of the Greek text, though his labours are now I think far less appreciated than they deserve to be; the two corrections he makes, are, to add the circumflex to διαμενῖς in ver. 11, in order to give it a future signification, (this the Improved version adopts,) and in ver. 12 to read ἀλλὰ ξεις for ἐλῖξεις. For the former, *Griesbach* gives two *Uncial* authorities, and for the latter one, the fact is, both readings particularly agree with the Hebrew of Psalm cii, which is not the case with the received text, and on this very account the learned *Grabe* had previously judged it right to rectify the passage in the Septuagint in his edition of that Version.

---

HEBREWS xi. 3. We have in this passage a remarkable instance of the manner in which upon occasion, the differences between the *Editors* and the learned *Primate*, may be slurred over. The Editors read, "by faith we understand that the  
ages

ages were so ordered by the word of God, that the present state of things arose not from what did then appear;" for this reading they refer us to *Wakefield* and *Sykes*; adding however that the *Primate* takes the words in the popular sense, "by faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God; so that the things which are seen were not made of things which appeared\*." As the *Notes* of the Editors are the chief engines employed against us, it is fit to consult the *Primate's notes* also as well as his Version; they are not indeed always so friendly as we could wish, but here he argues the case for us, viz. the world.] This term is explained in the following clause, by the things which are seen: so that it must be understood of the visible material world, called into being by the word or command of God.—But if they will still persist in rendering αἰῶνες, dispensations; see what has been said above of the βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων.

Another instance similar to the above we have in the very next chapter, where the Apostle refers to the delivery of the Law on Mount Sinai. Nothing surely can be more evident than that in the Jewish Phraseology, (to which the Editors profess to have a particular respect in their interpretations) he who delivered the Law on Mount Sinai was the *Angel of the Covenant*, and therefore the *Primate* himself, in his note on ver. 26, chap. xii, expressly observes, "this favours the supposition that our Lord was the *Angel of the Covenant* who presided at giving the Law." But the Editors endeavour to elude this by inserting the word God

\* Supported in a great measure surely by the following reading, 2 Mac. 7. 28, ἀξίω σε, τέκνον, ἀνελειψαῖνάς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἰδοῦναι, γινώσκαι, ὅτι ἐξ ὧν ὅλων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ Θεός.

without any authority whatsoever in ver. 25, βλέπετε μη παραιτησθε τον λαλουντα, which Newcome and others render, "see that ye refuse not *Him* who speaketh," they render, "see that ye refuse not *God* who speaketh." That this is done with a design to lead the unlearned away from any such conclusions as would follow from a right understandig of the Jewish phraseology and tenets, is very evident, because no other cause could lead to such an alteration; *him* who speaketh being quite sufficient to answer their ends, if the context did not strongly imply that Christ was the person alluded to through the whole passage. In Jewish phraseology, therefore, I shall venture to say, so far from really evading this conclusion they strengthen it; for if "Him who speaketh" mean as they say, *God*, then Christ is God, the Jehovah Angel<sup>e</sup>, the Angel  
of

\* "The Jehovah Angel of the Old Testament is no other than He, who in the fulness of time, was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." See Bishop Horsley's Hosea. And Mr. Bennet, a writer whom his Lordship particularly commends, observes, "since the world began, Messiah has appeared under different characters, and suited to the different prevailing dispensations of the Church. During the ages preceding his incarnation he was termed "the Angel in whom *Jehovah* put his *Name*." "The Angel of *his face*, who calls himself *Jehovah*, and to whom as we see in the case of Moses and Joshua, divine honours were paid—honours which created Angels, so far from demanding, are rather represented as declining; whom the Jewish Church, in her latter period, termed the *mimra* or *Word of Jehovah*." I am almost tempted to cite Dr. Carpenter himself in proof of the same point, for thus he paraphrases John i. 3. "He was the agent in all the wonderful manifestations of divine power and goodness, which have been made to *us*: in *every one* he was the *agent*;" *could* a *Jewish* writer say this, in the *Unitarian* sense of the terms? or *could* any *Jew* understand it so? I must declare, nothing to



of the Covenant, who gave the Law and instructed the Prophets; and the language of the Apostle is truly consistent with what the most eminent writers of ancient times, both Jews and Christians, believed and taught.

In 1 Pet. iii. 19, a third instance occurs, and much of the same nature. This passage has pretty generally been thought to allude to an antecedent interposition of Christ, when he appeared on the earth, not incarnate, but as the Jehovah Angel; and this the Primate expressly confirms, “by which spirit (see ver. 18.) he as the representative of *Jehovah* appeared on earth, and warned the old world of their guilt and impending punishment.” Gen. vi.—“he warned, I say, the spirits now kept in custody, or safe-guard, compare c. i. 5. [גִּשְׁרִיל] *Syr.* in *hades*, in the separate invisible state, to the judgement of the last day. See *Beza*, *Schmidius*, and *Elsner*, or, by which spirit he inspired *Noah*, and thus in effect went, [compare *ελθων*, Ephes. ii. 17,] and preached &c.” Such is the Primate’s own note upon the passage, and his rendering of ver. 19, (which the Editors indeed add,) is “by which also he went and preached to the spirits *now* in prison.” But the Editors Version has it, “by which after he was gone he preached to the spirits in prison.”

me can appear more laboured or more distant from the truth than the Unitarian paraphrases of this Proem, if really understood as they intend them. I am happy to find from Dr. Carpenter’s Summary, that he considers the *equality of the Son with the Father*, the *proper Deity of the Son* and his *pre-existence*, all countenanced by the *usual* translation of this introduction. He calls it of course a *mistranslation*, but who that can read Greek is bound to believe him, upon his mere word. Dr. C. himself does not I conceive expect it since he deals otherwise with us.

And

And though it is so plainly specified by the Apostle that the period alluded to was *formerly*, ποτε, even εν ημεραις Νωε, in the days of Noah, yet the Editors declare it was otherwise; that the allusion to those days is merely in the way of comparison, and only means that Christ preached *not* to the same individuals but to men like them, in the same circumstances, to their descendents, &c. And for this they cite Mr. *Lindsey*, as sufficient to stand alone against the *Primate* and all those whom he cites by *name*, not to mention the numbers of other most able writers who perfectly agree with him. I have already said, that I cannot trust so implicitly to Mr. *Lindsey's* Criticisms as the Editors seem to expect, and I hope upon this particular point any person capable of reading Latin will have wisdom enough, instead of being contented with Mr. *Lindsey's* Sequel, to consult *Beza's* long and excellent note upon the passage, to which the *Primate* (so much more properly,) refers us.—Bishop *Pearson* on the Creed, fol. Edit. 112, should also by all means be consulted. It is the more necessary to point these things out to the reader, because Dr. *Carpenter*, in his Letters to Mr. *Veysie*, approves and supports the construction put upon these passages by the Editors of the improved Version; and on this particular text ventures to assert that it *can have no reference* to the pre-existence of Christ\*. I still appeal with confidence from  
Dr.

\* The Dr. contends also for the Unitarian sense put upon John viii. 58. He insists upon it, that in the *plain* and *obvious* sense of words, the assertion I am *he* (which latter term is an interpolation of their own) refers to the time actually present, and not to the time before which Abraham existed. I can only say if this is so, there was neither argument nor answer

Dr. C. and Mr. Lindsey, and the *improved Version*, to *Beza*, *Pearson*, *Newcome*, &c.—in proof of this point. As to the general interpretation of the passage, I well know that critics have been more divided upon it than in regard to almost any other text of Scripture; I only wish to obtain a hearing for the commentators who may be cited in *favour* of the pre-existence of Christ, in answer to those to whom the Editors refer the reader with such confidence, in direct opposition to their chosen model Archbishop *Newcome*.

---

2 PETER i. 1. Though when I first sent my Remarks on the improved Version to the Editors of the Brit. Crit., I had foreborne to notice the example drawn from this passage in illustration of Mr. Sharp's Canon, because the Editors had marked this book of Scripture as a *disputed* one; (see *Brit. Crit.* Vol. xxxiv. 171.) Yet I shall now offer

answer in the reply of our Lord. Bishop Pearson on the contrary says, the nature of the place *absolutely requireth* that it should *not* denote a present being, but a *priority of existence*: see him cited by Newcome. That Bishop Pearson understood not the plain and obvious sense of words, would be a most extraordinary inference, yet so it must be if Dr. Carpenter is right. But what says the *Primate*, who particularly cites Pearson? he adds to the testimony of the latter as follows, "or there may be a reference to the name which God assumed, Exod. iii. 14. *Ego sum qui sum*; I am He that is: our Lord having been the visible *Jehovah* under the dispensations preceding the Evangelical." This great truth meets us so at every point that I hope it will be duly attended to by all into whose hands Unitarian tracts may fall.

some remarks upon it, because in Dr. Carpenter's late work he has declared that my reliance upon *that canon* is alone sufficient in his eyes to prove the *weakness* of the cause I support. Much as the learned are obliged to Mr. Sharp for recalling their attention to this subject of criticism, yet I am confident that pious and good man would rather forego the distinction bestowed on him, in having it called *his Canon*, than that any ill use should be made of it; it is not Mr. Sharp's invention; it is no rule of modern discovery; it is no newly devised Canon of Criticism at all; it is ancient; was approved, and acted upon, by numbers before Mr. Sharp was born, or heard of. This is well known to the learned but not to the unlearned, and it is for the latter that the Unitarians are now preparing their books; the real state of the case therefore should if possible be pointed out to them; they should be made to understand that the *old English* editions, are more conformable to the Greek original\*; see them cited upon this passage by Mr.

\* "As far as the *Greek* merely is concerned it is *admitted*, that it is a justifiable reading." Carpenter's Letters to Veysie, 49—as far as the *Greek* is concerned! then "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," is also justifiable undoubtedly, as far as the *English* is concerned. But if the Greek of Greek writers, and the English of English writers must, to be made into sense, undergo the revision and correction of Dr. Carpenter, then, before we may trust to either, we must need all go to school again to Dr. C. I wish not to be rude, but indeed, I cannot give up both Greek and English to Dr. Carpenter, when he *admits*, that *our* sense is justified by the idiom of either language; his concession is complete as far as the precise language of Scripture is concerned. He admits as much also with regard to Rom. ix. 5. In his Summary however, p. 100, he expressly calls the rendering of 1 Peter i. 1, an *unjustifiable* rendering; this is not fair.



Sharp as excellent testimonies in his favour. “*In the Righteousness that cometh of our God and Saviour Jesu Christ*,” fol. edit. 1549. “*Through the Righteousnesse of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ*,” 12mo. edit. 1595. “*By the Righteousnesse of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ*,” 4to. edit. 1599. “*The Righteousness of Jesus Christ our God and Saviour*,” margin of the fol. edit. 1611. See also Mr. Crutwell’s references (in his English Bible with Bishop Wilson’s notes) to the Versions of *Wickliffe*, *Coverdale*, *Matthews*, *Cranmer*, the *Bishop’s Bible*, *Geneva*, and *Rhemish Bibles*, for the reading “of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.” The same author refers to *Doddridge*, *Wesley*, *Scattergood*, and *Purver*; (to the above Mr. Middleton adds *Tindal*.) What strange work it is after this to represent it as any new *prop* lately adopted in aid of the Trinitarian cause. It appears to be an old established canon\*, that has been departed from, and which therefore deserves to be recalled to the notice of mankind. New translators are the very people we have to fear, as has been the case before; I shall give two instances of it, which may at once serve to show a striking correspondence between the present and former times, and the importance long ago attached to the canon on a similar occasion. Dr. Twells, to whom I have often before referred, thus comments then on the New Version that appeared in his days, viz. 1729. 2 Pet. i. 1. “It is observable,” says he, “that the absence of the *article* before *Σωτηρ* makes it evident, that God and Saviour are both *one person*, as above Tim. ii. 13:—but notwithstanding the *New Version*

\* Mr. Sharp’s principal rule must always be understood:

makes them two, "*through the veracity of God and of Jesus Christ.*" 2 Peter iii. 18, we have the very same construction, ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Here both Grotius and our translator make but one person spoken of. And the most probable reason of this exposition, *where the construction is perfectly similar*, is that they are willing to own Jesus Christ for their Lord, but unwilling to admit him for their God; whilst the Scripture in these passages alike declares *both or neither*. Our translator, to make sure work with the place before us, has dropt the words ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος in his Version, plainly because they favoured the orthodox sense of the place."

The comment of the same learned writer\* on Tit. ii. 13, to which he refers in the above, is as much to the purpose.

"Expecting the blessed Hope and glorious appearance of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ."—"This is the *literal* rendering of the Greek, καὶ ἐπιφανείαν τοῦ δοξῆς τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. So that *Jesus Christ* is here called *the great God*. But the new interpreter gives us a different version thus, *the glorious appearance of the supreme God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ*. But first ἐπιφάνεια is an expression never applied to the *Father*, (though Grotius affirms it without any proof,) but only to the glorious and last com-

\* Dr. Twells is particularly mentioned by Wolfius, as agreeing with Bishop Bull, Calvin and Vitringa, in supporting this sense of Tit. ii. 13. Wolfius's own remark is very strong to the purpose. "Articulus τῷ præmittendus fuisset vocis σωτῆρος, Tit. ii. 13, siquidem hic à μεγάλῳ Θεῷ distingui debuisset." Drusus also on the same text says, "non solum Deus, sed etiam *Deus Magnus* vocatur hic Christus." See the 3d Appendix to the 3d Edit. of Sharp on the Greek Article.

ing of the Son \*. Secondly, there is no *article* before *Σωτηρ*, as there would have been if *the Saviour* had been a different person from *the Supreme God*, and therefore they are both the same. *Grotius* indeed upon this occasion tells us, that the *article* is often omitted by *St. Paul*, where it regularly should be expressed; but he neither does nor can produce one instance of such omission, where it endangers the confounding of two distinct persons, so that *Tit. i. 4* is no exception to us, because *πατήρ* being added to *Θεὸς* prevents all possible mistake, though the *article* be omitted, but in the passage before us, the *article* is necessary to the sense of the *New Version*, and therefore would certainly have been inserted, if any such sense had been intended.

It is certainly somewhat remarkable, but perfectly true, that the book from which I make the above extracts, though long known to the learned, did not only not come into my possession, till long after my *Remarks* in the *Brit. Crit.* had been printed, on which *Dr. Carpenter* has commented so severely, but actually not till after I had procured his own book in which his censure of me appears, and in which he speaks of *Mr. Sharp's Canon* as though all the *Trinitarians* were eagerly catching at it, as the last hope of their cause; a cable newly thrown out to them when in the very act of sinking; let the

\* Τοι γὰρ υἱοὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας καὶ παρουσίας ἐνδεχομένη, οὐ τὸ πᾶν.  
*Basil. Contra. Eunom.* See *Wordsworth's Letters*; see also his citation from the *Homilies of Chrysostom*, p. 80.

*Mr. Wordsworth's* authorities for the reading of this passage, as amended by *Mr. Sharp*, are so very numerous and particular, that I confess I am astonished how it can be any longer doubted: those who have not read his book ought to know that he produces no less than 54 Greek authorities for it, extending from the second to the 12th Century, a period of nearly a thousand years.

world then judge whether this be so. Seventy-four years ago it appears the same Canon was applied\*, *under exactly the same circumstances*, viz. in reproof of a too venturesome translator; and had it been so manifest a proof of a *weak* cause, as Dr. C. would insinuate it to be, how shall we account for the Unitarians not having made a greater progress in the interval that has elapsed? How shall we account for their extreme jealousy of Mr. Sharp's interference of late, except that they are afraid of his own references to ancient *versions*, and *long established* authorities.

It is but *fair* to add one more comment from the same learned writer, on another passage which the present Editors have converted to their own purposes, viz. Jude, ver. 4. "The New Text, says Dr. Twells, runs thus: *τον μονον δεσποτην, Θεον και Κυριον ημων Ιησυν Χριστον αρνημενοι*: denying our only Master, God and Lord, Jesus Christ." But such a literal translation hurts Arianism; (the Author had not to do with *perfect Unitarians*;) "for which reason," (he proceeds,) the translator takes leave of the text, and gives us his own *English prejudices*. "And renounce," says he, "their only Master, and Jesus Christ our Lord." First, he puts in the word *their*, to which nothing answers in the *Greek*; next he overlooks *Θεον* in his Version †.

\* See also Jones on the Trinity, Art. XIII. XL, a late edition of which was published 43 years ago.

† *Θεον* is certainly omitted in MSS. of high authority, but Mr. Sharp has shown that this would not alter the case, indeed it would not according to the argument of the greatest adversaries of the canon, for they contend so strongly for the exclusive application of the term *δεσποτης* to the Father, that if *δεσποτην* alone can be shown to be connected with *κυριος*, i. e. x. The case is proved, and the omission of *Θεον* only makes it more evident.

Lastly,



Lastly, he makes *δεσποτην* denote *God the Father*, though *Grotius* explains it of the *Son*, and the parallel place 2 Pet. ii. 1, makes this explication necessary, for there it is said of this very sort of men, that they deny *τον αγοραζοντα αυτους δεσποτην*, their Master that bought or redeemed them.

Now the present Editors, (with whom I happen to have to do) rather puzzle me. First, they render the passage in Jude, “denying the only Sovereign, and our Lord Jesus Christ.” Which is completely open to the correction of the criticism above, but in referring to 2 Peter ii. 1, which Dr. Twells calls a parallel passage, and in which he concludes it to be indisputable that *δεσποτην* is predicated of Jesus Christ, I not only find the whole Chapter marked by the Editors as spurious, contrary to *Griesbach* and *Newcome*, their two prime authorities, but I find them rendering it, *the Sovereign Lord who bought them*, and informing us in their note that Dr. Whitby interprets this of God the Father, who *only* is called *Δεσποτης* in the New Testament. Dr. Whitby’s comment is not much to the purpose, and I wonder at the Primate’s noticing it as he does; to refer to Deut. xxxii. 6, and Exodus xv. 16, as a passage at all correspondent to 2 Cor. vi. 20, is sufficient at once to invalidate all the criticism. In the latter a price is spoken of, and the term is *αγορασθης*; in the former texts no price is alluded to, and the Hebrew term is far more general\*. As to *Δεσποτης*, surely Parkhurst’s Lexicon must have been at their command, who defends Grotius against Clarke upon this; and by whom in my opinion texts enough are adduced to prove that *Δεσποτης* is

\* See Gen. iv. 1—besides in Exodus xv. 16; Deut. xxxii. 6; the LXX has *κτηνω* and *κτηνοιο*.

by no means exclusively applied to the Father, certainly to Christ also, and the Holy Ghost. Let their objections however to *this* reference be what they may, I would leave the case to their own arbitration. They often refer to *Locke* as a favourite commentator, and are very ready to adopt his reasonings against the notions of any compensation being made to God by the death of Christ, in the way of ransom or atonement. One of *Locke's* principle arguments is put into the form of a question, "if any one will persist in maintaining that an equivalent price was paid, I desire him to consider to whom;" and he insists upon it, that it must be to *Satan*, to whom we were in bondage. Now we would ask the Editors to whom *they* imagine the price was paid for those whom our *Sovereign Lord* is said in their Version to have bought, meaning *God the Father*\*? True it is they convert this into a figurative expression, telling us that it means only, "the providing means for their deliverance from idolatry and vice;" but how could this be expressed by so incongruous a trope as that of buying them? St. Paul fairly tells us, 1 Cor. vi. 20, that we are *bought with a price*, and our Lord himself assured us, that he came into the world to give his life a ransom for many. Surely we have no right to say that all these expressions are intended to convey a meaning totally *contrary* to the payment of any price, or ransom, or equivalent; I say totally contrary, for what can be more contrary than a purchase, without a price paid. The term *αγοραζω* I think I may venture to say is never applied by the sacred writers of the New Testament,

\* Attend to the disputed reading of Acts xx. 28, the Church of God, which he has *purchased* with his own blood.

except where a proper purchase is intended. It is sometimes certainly rendered by the term *redeem*; as in the famous passage referred to below, Rev. v. 9; but there also the very *price* of our redemption is mentioned; the expression is very strong, and comprehends every point, ἡγορασας ΤΩ ΘΕΩ η̅μας  
ἐν τῷ αἱματι σου.

Redemption may be used for buying, because a price may be generally included, but buying cannot *generally* be used for redemption, and I think it is not a good rendering in the two passages cited by Whitby; viz. Exod. xv. 16, and Deut. xxxii. 6. I have an old English Bible now before me, in which nothing appears either of the term *bought* or *purchased*, but the Hebrew is rendered far more consistently with the general use of the verb קנה. It is often indeed used in the proper sense of buying, where a price is included, as Gen. xxv. 10; xlvii. 22; xlix. 30; Joshua xxiv. 32; 2 Sam. xii. 3, &c. But in regard to the two passages above, the terms *bought* and *purchased* can only be applied figuratively; in Buxtorf's Concordance, the first text will be found under *acquisivisti*, the latter under *possessor* aut *Emptor*; the first term of these two is preferable. My old Black Letter Version reads, "is he not thine *Owner*," with reference no doubt to the Peculium, which מקנה signifies, commonly expressed by סגל. The term *bought* then seems proper, 2 Peter ii. 1. And if they admit that it was our *Sovereign Lord* who bought us, which they do by *their Version*, I leave it to them to extricate themselves from the two dilemmas they seem to have fallen into; first, the one suggested by *Locke*, to whom was the price paid? And secondly, who bought us in any sense of the word but Christ, consistently with the language of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 23; and the positive declarations of our Lord himself?



himself? Matth. xx. 28, Mark x. 45. See also Acts xx. 28, Rev. v. 9, and 1 Peter ii. 9, where we read, “a *purchased* people,” as the Editors properly enough render λαός εις περιποίησιν. I shall only observe further, that the rendering adopted by the Editors would exactly reconcile the Evangelist and the Prophet, John xix. 37; Zechariah xii. 4. “And again,” saith the Evangelist, “another Scripture saith, they shall look on him whom they pierced.” The Scripture alluded to is beyond all doubt Zechariah xxii. 4; where we read in the original, as contended for by most eminent writers, and which cannot I think be fairly evaded; “And they shall look upon ME whom they have pierced,” which words were spoken by THE LORD (JEHOVAH.) See ver. 4. Or if we would go a little further back, namely, to ver. 1, most evidently by the דבר יהוה, the *Verbum Jehovah*, or WORD of GOD. So that the case would stand thus; (if I go a step beyond the exact words of Scripture as it lies before me, and the rendering of the improved Version, I surely lay myself open to detection;) the Prophet delivers to us, “the burden of the WORD of the LORD (JEHOVAH.) Thus saith the *Lord*, (the *Sovereign Lord* undoubtedly for it is in the original יהוה,) which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the sprit of man within him.” “I will pour upon the House of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of Grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon *me* whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him \* as one mourneth for his only son.” This is

\* I shall make no other remark upon this change of persons, than to observe, that according to all that I have laid down in the



the Scripture which St. John tells us was fulfilled in the first instance at the crucifixion of our LORD Jesus Christ. It is probably also that very Evangelist who says exactly the same of the future advent of Jesus Christ, "him who loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood," Rev. i. 5. "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also that pierced him," ver. 7. This is the Evangelist who tells us the WORD of God was made flesh and dwelt among us, *that word* which was in the beginning with God, &c.; in short the *Verbum Jehovah* in Jewish Phraseology, which is equivalent to Jehovah, the Sovereign Lord of all, whom the Editors admit, in their rendering of 2 Peter ii. 1—"bought us,"—but it is the concurrent testimony of all the books of the New Testament, nay it is the very assertion of Christ Jesus himself, that *He* bought us, or in his own words, that he gave his life a ransom for many, Matth. xx. 28; Mark x. 45, which St. John tells us in the Revelations was "buying us to God by his blood,"—*ὑποπαράσκει*.

I feel that I ought still to add what Dr. Carpenter says upon this subject, and which had es-

the former part of these Remarks, the *Angelus Redemptor* must be understood as one with JEHOVAH. It would surely therefore be taking no undue advantage to insist upon this conformity in the Prophets expressions, for it occurs elsewhere. See Isaiah xxxiv. 16, and Jones on the Trinity, p. 214, (if this be objected to others might be produced,) very particularly Malachi iii. 1; see p. 6 of these Remarks. The Jews themselves applied this passage to the Messias, not however without some efforts to avoid the force of the original. See Bishop Pearson on the ivth Art. of the Creed, fol. 201; see also Grotius's notes on the place, and Bishop Chandler's Defence of Christianity, &c.

caped

caped my notice. "Gal. iii. 13, 'Christ has redeemed, ἐξηγοράσεν, us from the curse of the law, becoming a curse for us.' The word rendered *redeemed*, says the Dr., might justly have been rendered *bought off*, and *figuratively* speaking the death of our Saviour was a *price*, in as much as it was the grand *means* by which Gospel blessings were diffused; the rest was the immediate agency of divine power communicated to him; that it was not *literally* a *price* is obvious; for this would imply a *seller*, and assuredly we were not bought from God but to God; see Rev. v. 9."—He adds in a note, these remarks will it is apprehended fully explain corresponding Phraseology in 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; 1 Peter i. 18; Rev. v. 9. In 2 Pet. i. 1, we find the expression, 'even denying the Lord, δεσποίν, that bought them.' "The appellation δεσποτης, *Sovereign Lord*, being appropriate to God, this passage must be referred to him; comp. Exod. xv. 16; Deut. xxxii. 6; on the mode of expression; see *Taylor's Key*, §. xii—xv." I have no opportunity of consulting this work. As to δεσποτης being appropriate to God, I deny it not, but that it is exclusively appropriate to the Father I do deny; I have already referred to Parkhurst; I think among the passages adduced by him to show that the title is given to the son, Rev. vi. 10, is perfectly in point, and Jude 4, (even I should think so as to satisfy Unitarians, since Θεου is to be expunged,) δεσποτης besides is sometimes the rendering in the LXX, for ὁ κύριος, and therefore peculiarly applicable to the Adonai of the Temple; see before. To pay a price for the redemption of things or persons, is literally buying them; (see *Erasmus* and *Grotius* as cited by *Leigh* in his *Crit. Sacr.* voc. ἀπολυτρώσις;) To whom the price was paid I leave the Unitarians

ans to settle. The learned Henry Taylor says, Christ obtained of God the Father the power of saving us, as a reward for his obedience and sufferings; I conceive therefore that the price was paid to God the Father, to whom undoubtedly our lives were forfeited under the curse of the Law; see Doddridge on Gal. iii. 13. If it should seem strange that God should be made the agent on both sides, I can only explain it in the words of St. Paul, viz. "now *all things* are of God, *who* was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," which if it does not satisfy Unitarians, I cannot help it.

---

THE two last chapters of this sublime book demand particular attention. Nothing can possibly be more magnificent than the account here given of the consummation of all things, particularly the end of the Gospel dispensation. I was happy to find this surprising book cordially received by the Editors as authentic; their note upon this subject at the beginning is valuable. It has been long known that some of the strongest arguments in favour of the divinity of Christ, have been drawn from hence, particularly in regard to the marked appropriation of certain of the highest titles of the Deity to the person of the Redeemer. To this particular point, therefore, I shall chiefly confine my Remarks. In that glorious appearance of the Saviour of the world represented in the *xxiid* Chapter we find him described as thus addressing  
 John

John—"Behold I will come quickly : and my reward will be with me to give unto every man according as his work shall be. I am *alpha* and *omega*, the *beginning* and *the end*, the *first* and *the last*." In this passage there is no material difficulty arising from the various readings; some transposition of the latter words, and a partial omission of the  $\tau\omicron$   $\Lambda$   $\chi\alpha\iota$   $\tau\omicron$   $\Omega$ , but not of weight enough to justify their rejection. It seems scarcely possible to suppose them not to be spoken of the person of the Redeemer, though possibly with a reference also to his office and ministry. But the present Editors show a manifest disposition to weaken this evidence as much as possible. They certainly do not mean peremptorily to deny that these expressions apply particularly to Christ, because they add a note to explain them of the dispensation of the Gospel solely; but because the Primate had thought it necessary to introduce the words, *saith Jesus*, after behold, here and in ver. 7, they are careful to *point out* to their readers, that this is an interpolation, "without any authority from the text." Surely then they would infer that the words were spoken in the very person of the angel; but this cannot be their intention because they do not seem to admit the Angel here to be an Angel. "I Jesus have sent mine Angel," ver. 16, signifies it seems, "I Jesus have sent this Messenger of mine, i. e. John:" for this Mr. Wakefield is cited, but as this Gentleman, notwithstanding his great learning is candidly acknowledged by a celebrated Unitarian, to have been *at times*, "guided by theological prepossessions, rather than by a spirit of sound criticism," (see Carpenter's Letters to Veysie, p. 16; Mr. Jones seems to think still worse of his criticisms; see Appendix to his Illustrations,



Illustrations, No 4.) surely this bias had a great effect upon him in this instance, for that there was an Angel sent to John, John himself as plainly declares as possible, ver. 8. Indeed they only embarrass the question unnecessarily, for they admit that an Angel spoke in the former part of the Chapter, and are particularly eager to take advantage of Archbishop Newcome on this very account; the Primate thus renders, ver. 6, 7, “then *the Angel* said unto me, these words are worthy of belief and true: and the Lord God of the spirits of the Prophets has sent his Angel to show his servants the things which must shortly come to pass;” “for, behold, *saith Jesus*, I will come quickly: happy is he who keepeth the words of the Prophecy of this book.” Then the improved Version proceeds in exact agreement with the Primate, “and I John saw these things, and heard them, and when I heard and seen I fell down to worship before the feet of the Angel who showed me these things, then he saith unto me, ‘see thou do it not: I am a fellow servant, &c.’ Here they introduce the following brief but pregnant note. “Observe that if *Jesus* is the speaker in ver. 7, he is also the speaker *here*.” That is, in other words, mark the *rashness* of the learned *Primate*; he ventures without any authority from the text, to introduce the words *saith Jesus*, which of course ought to be noticed as a trick, calculated to make you fancy that Jesus is the *alpha* and *omega*, the *Lord God of the Spirits of the Prophets*, who had sent an Angel to John as his representative; be sure then we are not for expunging this *saith Jesus*, at least from ver. 7, for by this means we may fairly turn the tables upon the Archbishop, and insist upon it that Jesus actually describes himself to be  
a mere

a *more fellow-servant* of John. Now this is certainly ingenious, but by no means ingenuous; the words *saith Jesus*, are undoubtedly not in the text. The Primate introduces them by way of supplying what to him appeared to be as plainly as possible intended; they do not deny his inference, except by an appeal to the text; but they take advantage of the very words, to turn them against himself; for the Archbishop most indisputably intended, as may be seen from his own notes, to intimate, that it was an *Angel*, who addressed John, as the *Messenger* and *representative* of Jesus, sometimes speaking in his own person, sometimes in that of him who sent him, as is and must be the case with all representatives, and that it was because he *only represented* the Redeemer, that he declined the homage offered to him; which offer in itself is, in my estimation, a direct proof, that the Primate's *saith Jesus* is rightly introduced, and that when he spoke in the very words of him who sent him, viz. the LORD GOD of the Spirits of the Prophets, i. e. the blessed Jesus, (see verse 16,) John fell down to worship him, as (for instance) the *very Angel of the Covenant*. The conduct of the Angel tends to confirm the same interpretation, being a plain argument that he judged it necessary to explain, that though sometimes he spake as his principal, he was still but a *representative* of the Redeemer, a "*fellow-servant*" with John.

But the Archbishop's, "*saith Jesus*," in both passages, has the consent and approbation of numerous commentators; even *Grotius* says, λεγων should be understood, ver. 7, before ιδε ερχομαι ταχυ, referring to the Κυριος ο Θεος των πνευματων, ver. 6, which is equivalent, he tells us, to Jehovah, and he says

says such a mode of speaking is common with the Prophets \*; and in the 2d instance, though he begins somewhat higher than the Primate, viz. ver. 10, he observes, “sequitur hic dialogus inter Dominum Jesum et Johannem, *non appositis personarum nominibus, sed quæ faciliè ex verbis subintelliguntur.* Hic loqui incipit Jesus.” I might cite abundance more, but *Grotius* is an authority they are partial to; I cannot, however, refrain from adding *Beza’s* proposed amendment, which is certainly a *plausible* one, though I had rather the text should stand as it is, that we may appear to take no unwarrantable advantages whatsoever, or to be under any *necessity* of altering the present most approved reading. *Beza himself* suspects some trick has been played in the *transposition* of the verses of Ch. xxii; be this as it may, *his* arrangement is worth mentioning.

He dwells upon the extreme caution of the Angel in guarding against the mistake into which John had fallen, and the earnestness with which he had declined the homage of the latter, taking such especial care to distinguish between Christ and himself: he thinks therefore he could scarcely so soon afterwards venture again to speak in the person of Christ: his words are strong: “Nec enim nisi admodum violenter existimari possit *hic* angelus loqui in mittentis Christi personâ, à quâ paulo antè sese tam expresse discreverit, non sustinens *adorari* :” he proposes therefore to read it thus: putting the 14th verse in the place of the 12th.

\* On Ch. i. 18, he observes, “Personæ loquentes interdum subcentur;” and he particularly refers to the end of the book for instances.

12. Blessed are they that do his commandments that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

13. Without shall be (*erunt* B.) dogs, and sorcerers, and fornicators and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.

Here he terminates the address of the *Angel*, and proceeds:

Ver. 14. I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these things in the Churches. I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright morning-star.

15. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.

16. And, Behold I come quickly and my reward is with me to give to every man, according as his work shall be.

17. And the Spirit and the Bride, &c. Beza acknowledges, that he was led to suspect some artful transposition of these verses from the expression in ver. 14: Blessed are they that do *his* commandments; which, if spoken by Jesus himself, or in his person, should be *my* commandments. The Primate renders it "God's commandments," which the Editors are careful enough to notice. They do not, however, notice another circumstance that deserves to be mentioned, namely, that there is a various reading of this passage, which the learned *Wells* thinks well enough supported to take into his text; he reads it, instead of οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ, οἱ πλυνόντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, "Blessed are they that wash their garments, that they may have right, &c." It seems, that the *Vulgate* not only has "*Beati qui lavant stolas suas*, but adds, by way of interpretation, *in sanguine agni*, which carries us



back immediately to Ch. vii. 14, where we read of *the blessed*, that they will consist of those who, *ἐπλυναν τὰς πόδας αὐτῶν—ἐν τῷ αἱματὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου*: now considering that there are other respectable authorities for this reading, the *Alexandrian MS.* among others, I think Dr. Wells did not do amiss to take it into his text; and *Griesbach*, who of course confirms all that is said above, marks it in his margin as a *lectio speciosa* \*.

After all, the change of persons in such addresses, *non appositis personarum nominibus*, as *Grotius* expresses it, is so common a circumstance in the prophetic writings, that it can be no difficult matter to distinguish what may fairly be supposed to be spoken in the person of the *Sender*, or of the *Sent*; the *Principal* or the *Representative*. I conceive that very few could really doubt that the terms, *saith Jesus*, ought to be understood at ver. 7, and ver. 12; and perhaps also elsewhere; and that *the Angel* may as reasonably be introduced, ver. 1, and ver. 6, which the *Primate* has taken care to do, though likewise without any positive authority from the text.

But the expression, “I am *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *beginning* and the *end*,” occurs also in the preceding Chapter, xxi. 6. Upon this passage the *Primate* observes, “The words are understood of the *Father*,” Chap. i. 8; and of the *Son*, Chap. xxii. 13. But in this particular place, of whom are they

\* *Grotius* also particularly takes notice of it, but has another method of getting rid of the difficulty attending *αὐτῶν*, for he thinks *John* here, in his own person, addresses his readers. So that there he would introduce, “*saith John*,” which would be allowable from his opinion of the prophetic style.

supposed to be spoken? No doubt the Editors will naturally think, that "He who sat on the throne," ver. 5, will pass at once for God the Father. Therefore we find no notes of explanation here; and yet the Primate corrects *Vitranga*, who would have it, "Vox est Dei Patris." I rather suppose, saith he, that the *Great Representative of Jehovah* is here meant, referring us most reasonably to Chap. xx. 11: "I saw a great white throne, and Him who sat on it;" i. e. says the Primate, Christ the *Judge of all*, ver. 12, and so it seems certainly to be; so Grotius understands it, and many others.

Dr. Carpenter seems to think it of much importance to the cause of Unitarianism; that according to the improved Version, and the corrected text of Griesbach, verses 8 and 11 of Chap. i, must be read differently from the received text; that in the former, the terms, "the beginning and the end," should be omitted; and in the latter, the words, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last:" now the latter I grant to be of some importance, because there is known to be a difference of opinion as to the application of the terms in ver. 8, whereas in ver. 11, if they were authentic, they would be clearly spoken of the Son, and would therefore either bespeak a community of attributes, or help to confirm the application of the former to the Son likewise; however, I am myself so persuaded that the titles, which undoubtedly are appropriated to *Jehovah*, Isaiah xlv. 6, xlviii. 12, are also given to Christ, in some parts of this sublime book, and that also with such an emphasis, and in so absolute a manner as ought to have weight with Unitarians, *with the Article* so much elsewhere stood upon as Bishop Pearson ob-

serves; τὸ α and το Ω, ὁ πρῶτος and ὁ ἔσχατος \* : that I can never admit, that Unitarianism is at all advantaged by these corrections ; they seem to talk of them as *new*, but they are very nearly an hundred years old ; the public may take my word for it, that that impartial *Trinitarian*, Dr. *Wells*, whom I have so often had occasion to mention, published the Greek text of these two verses in perfect conformity to Griesbaech's corrections, so long ago as the year 1715, even inserting the term Θεός, ver. 8, and his old Version is almost word for word the same as this very modern *improved* one. The only difference being, that he has *who* for *that* in ver. 8, and *unto* instead of *to* before the several churches, ver. 11. How very trifling after this does Mr. Belsham's triumph over his *Arian* friend Mr. Carpenter, appear, when he so exultingly enquires, (see his Letters on Arianism, 1808, p. 77,) "Did he *never* hear that the church of God, Acts xx. 28, was *wrong* ? and also God was manifested in the flesh, 1 Tim. iii. 15 ; and, to add *no more*, that Rev. i. 11, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last," which Dr. Doddridge solemnly records in his note upon the passage, "as having done more than any other in the Bible towards preventing him from giving into the scheme, which would make

\* We might add ὁ ζῶν, Ch. i. 13, which in our received text is improperly separated from its fellow epithets, ὁ πρῶτος and ὁ ἔσχατος. Newcome and the Editors partly correct this, reading it, "I am the first, and the last ; and he that lived :" but a very learned writer, Mr. Bennett of Carlisle, in his book entitled *Olam. Haneshamoth*, contends for its being read, "I am the First and the Last, and the living Being ; but I was dead, &c." comparing it with Isaiah xlv. 6, "I am the First and the Last, and besides me there is no God :" see also Sharp on the Article.

our Lord Jesus Christ no more than a deified creature," is *plainly proved an interpolation*; and as such is left out in the *corrected* text of Griesbach, and the Version of Archbishop Newcome:—And lo! it was left out 95 years ago in the corrected text of the learned Edward Wells, and in his Version also; yet does he not hesitate to give the very same words to Christ, Ch. xxi. 6, xxii. 13; and to receive them as indisputable evidences of Christ's divinity; and I will venture to say the learned Doddridge would have done the same, had this *new discovered* interpolation, (as Mr. B. seems to consider it) been pointed out to *him*; for I see nothing in the note Mr. B. refers to, that would have prevented Dr. Doddridge drawing exactly the same conclusions from *any* text in which those titles appeared to be clearly given to Christ, and he expresses no doubt whatever of this being the case, Ch. xxii. 13.; he has some little hesitation about Ch. xxi. 6, but Ch. i. 8, he assigns to Christ, because most of the phrases there used are *afterwards* used, concerning our Lord Jesus Christ; he only fixes upon the 11th verse of that Chapter as the first and nearest instance, at least so it undoubtedly appears to me; and I think his reference to Bishop Pearson is sufficient to *prove* it, since the latter lays quite as much stress upon Rev. xxii. 13, as upon Rev. i. 11. Mr. Belsham triumphs over his friend upon the *new* discovery also, that *δια τῆς Χριστοῦ* should be omitted, Ephes. iii. 9, enumerating abundance of MSS. and Versions in proof of this. Now these words also, the impartial Wells discarded in the beginning of the last century, and yet lived and died a Trinitarian.

In short, and to draw to a conclusion, it clearly appears to me that little has been gained to any party,



party, and nothing certainly lost to ourselves and other Trinitarians, by the immense mass of various readings accumulated during the last century. At the very beginning of that century, many of the most important were duly examined, and applied both to the correction of the Greek text, and the amendment of the common Version; much more impartially than appears to be the case with the Version lately edited; especially if we take into account the notes added to the larger Edition, which I trust I have shown to be, most artfully put together, totally contrary to the doctrines and opinions of many of the most able commentators that ever lived, and frequently in direct opposition to the learned Primate, whose name stands so conspicuous in their title-page, but whose authority has no weight whatever with them, where his comments or his Version happen in the smallest degree to interfere with the creed of modern Unitarians.

I am not sensible, that I have taken a single step in the course of these remarks, beyond the bounds prescribed to Christians in general by *Unitarians* themselves. Mr. *Belsham* declares it to be “an *imperious duty laid upon every* serious and enlightened Christian to contribute his utmost to instruct and benefit his fellow-creatures; and to enter his *grave and solemn* protest against those errors which disfigure and disgrace the Christian Religion:” and Dr. *Carpenter* in order to encourage the exertions of his party, observes, that “however much we might feel authorized to sit down quietly in the possession of what we think to be Gospel truth, without attempting to spread it among others, if those who adopt contrary opinions were equally inactive, yet certainly *when they are making every effort to disseminate their*

*tenets,*

*tenets*, we ought not to be behind hand to disseminate *ours*." If any thing is free, thought is so. Mr. *Belsham* and Dr. *Carpenter* think all the errors are on our side, which is exactly what I think of their tenets. But as I have taken their own course in combating what appear to me to be errors of great moment in their way of thinking, and to publish my protest against them, in as serious, grave and solemn a manner as I could, I hope they will be consistent enough to regard me as a person actuated by that very spirit, they so much commend in themselves; *enlightened* is a term of *dubious* import; I lay no claim to it; a most conscientious regard to truth, and a becoming diligence in searching the Scriptures as far as my abilities and means extend, are all the pretensions I wish to insist upon; I had intended to say more upon some other topics, which I shall now pass over; particularly that which relates to the *existence and agency of evil spirits*; all such agency, as well as the very existence of such beings, the Editors of this improved Version, and I believe the Unitarians in general deny, resolving all that is said of such matters in the Scriptures into a figure of speech, an *accommodation* (very unlikely surely in the book of God) to *heathenish conceits* and *Jewish superstitions*. Denial is no proof, and as to the few arguments with which this denial is supported in the work before us, I confess they appear to me little calculated to have any weight against the express declarations of Scripture. I should, however, have gone farther into this and other subjects, had not my Remarks already far exceeded the limits I wished to assign to them.

My great object has been to maintain and uphold the doctrines of Atonement and the Trinity in  
the

the Godhead. That Trinity into the name of which so \* many of us have been baptized; το ὄνομα τῷ πατρός, καὶ τῷ υἱοῦ, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, — the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST, a passage, of which I am happy to say, neither *Griesbach*, nor *Newcome*, nor the *Editors* themselves attempt to deprive us. The latter inform us that some have called in question its genuineness, (and I remember that Mr. *Evanson* has done so,) but they add, *without sufficient authority*, which is surely true, for *Griesbach* does not produce one single instance of its omission. The Editors indeed speak of it in their notes, as a symbolical profession of that holy religion which originated with the *Father*, was taught by *Christ*, (the *Servant* and *Messenger* of God,) and confirmed by the gifts of the Holy Spirit; they assure

\* Nothing is more common than for the Unitarians to insist upon the contradictions into which Trinitarians fall, in their expositions of their faith. I wish all such expositions to be avoided, because they depend upon a branch of metaphysics, which must upon some points, evade our researches; but it is astonishing how some of the contradictions alleged against us vanish, even when examined by a comparison with familiar objects. Dr. C. calls the doctrine of Christ's omnipresence, a *stupendous* doctrine, and apologizes for so strong a term by observing, "that the doctrine supposes, that he who is present at the same instant in every part of the unbounded universe, descended from a local residence, limited himself to the narrow confines of a narrow region on this Earth, and for thirty years dwelt in a human body;" he cautiously adds, "as we do not know the nature of the Divine Presence, it might be presumption to say that this is impossible," and so indeed it would be, for even the nature of the human presence may satisfy our doubts; for is not any man capable of being present to every part of a room, and to every person in it, though he seems to occupy but one small portion of it, and may move continually from one end of it to the other? See this admirably argued in *Deism Revealed*, Vol. ii. pp. 88, 89.

the world that the Holy Spirit's being here named in connection with the Father and the Son is no proof that the Spirit has a distinct personal existence. I shall only say at present, that to me, and I apprehend to very many others, nothing could possibly appear to be a greater proof of it, and as it appears to be confirmed by many plain passages of holy writ, in which distinct personal acts are ascribed to the Holy Spirit, I do not hesitate to receive it, on the word of Christ, as an undoubted truth.

It has been my endeavour to show, not only in what sense Christ was an Angel or Messenger, but that he was by nature the Son of the most High, one with him in the unity of the Godhead; and I have chiefly drawn my proofs of this from the names and attributes assigned to him, in common with the Father. This is a proof, in my estimation, so strong and so incapable of being overthrown, that I should be content to rest my faith upon it alone, but that I feel and am assured besides, that our Lord himself *asserted it before his accusers\**, and no other proof can be requisite: how-

\* Our Saviour's behaviour under the charge of blasphemy urged against him by the Jews, is to me the strongest, I may even say, the *fundamental* proof of the Trinitarian doctrine. I have said much upon this in my VIIth *Bampton Lecture*, and in the notes there, and I only repeat it here, to explain what I mean when I say that like Dr. Blayney, I rely upon *Gospel* proofs. Did not the Trinity appear to me to be a doctrine of Christ, I should of course never look for it in the Jewish SS. but being persuaded of its revelation in the Gospel of Christ, I turn with pleasure and satisfaction always to the consideration of those marvellous circumstances which connect the *Old Testament* with the *New*, and which tend so remarkably to show, that the *Christian scheme* (including the doctrine of the Trinity) is only the continuance of one great design



however, in regard to the former attestation, on which I have had occasion more particularly to insist in the foregoing remarks, I cannot forbear adding the following observations of the celebrated President *Edwards*, recommending them to the attention of all serious and devout Christians.

“ If the temptation to the children of Israel was so great, to idolize the *brazen Serpent*, a lifeless piece of brass, for the temporal salvation, which some of their forefathers had by looking on it; how great would be their temptation to idolatry by worshipping *Christ*, if he were a mere creature, from whom mankind receive so great benefits?

“ If that *brazen Serpent* must be broken in pieces, to remove temptation to idolatry, 2 Kings xviii. 4. Shall so great a temptation be laid before the

design of Providence, to bring men to eternal life by Jesus Christ, the *Angel of the Covenant*; the *Adon* or *Lord* of the *Temple*. Dr. Carpenter, I am sorry to say, would deprive me even of the proof I so particularly rely upon. He says the charge of blasphemy was unfounded, both as to fact, and as to the inference from the supposed fact; and he asks, Are we to rest our faith upon the perverse insinuations of the Jews? I answer, No; not if they were really so perverse and so unfounded as to fact; but these very things remain to be proved, and our Lord's conduct it is that justifies the inference we draw from it. The Jews, whether maliciously or not, could not charge him with blasphemy, as assuming to be God in the low sense the Unitarians insist upon, they must have pretended at least, that he made himself God in the highest sense, and doing so, is it possible to suppose our Lord would have left them in such an error, and died under such a charge, had there been no foundations for it; would he have acted so, as even to increase their suspicions and aggravate their wrath: but I must refer, as I have done on another occasion, to Bishop *Burgess's* Sermon on the Subject, and *Fuller's Socinian and Calvinistic Systems compared*. See also of older writers, *Leslie's Socinian Controversy*, *Stillingfleet on Scripture Miracles*, and *Waterland's Vindication of Christ's Divinity*. Query xix. p. 280.

world, to idolize a *mere creature*, by setting him forth in the manner that *Christ* is set forth in Scripture?

“Must Moses’s body be concealed, lest the children of Israel should worship the remains of him whom God made the instrument of such great things? And shall another *mere creature*, whom men, on account of the works he has done, are under infinitely greater temptation to worship, instead of being concealed to prevent this, be most openly and publicly exhibited, as *exalted to Heaven*, seated at *God’s own right hand*, made *head over all things*, *Ruler of the Universe*, &c. in the manner that *Christ* is?

“Was not *this* the temptation among all nations to idolatry, viz. that *men* had been distinguished as great conquerors, deliverers, and the instruments of great benefit? and shall God make a *mere creature* the instrument of so many infinitely greater benefits, and in such a manner as *Christ* is represented to be in the Scripture, without an infinitely greater temptation to idolatry?

“When the rich young man called *Christ* good Master, not supposing him to be God, did *Christ* reject it; and reprove him for calling him so, supposing him not to be God; saying, there is none good but one, that is God; meaning that none other was possessed of that goodness that was to be trusted? And yet shall this same *Jesus*, though indeed not that God, not that God who only is to be called good, or trusted in as such, be called in Scripture, *HE* that is *holy* \*; *HE* that is *true*?  
the

\* Compare Isaiah lvii. 15. “Thus saith JEHOVAH whose name is, the Holy One;” and Mark i. 24, Luke iv. 34, and John vi. 69; “Thou art the Holy One of God.” Improved Version.

the *Amen*? the *faithful* and *true witness*? the *mighty God*, the *everlasting Father*, the *Prince of Peace*? the *blessed* and the *only Potentate*? the *King of Kings* and *Lord of Lords*? the *Lord of Life*, that has life in himself, that all men might honour the *Son*, as they honour the *Father*? the *wisdom of God*, and the *power of God*? the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *beginning* and the *end*? God, *JEHOVAH*, *Elohim*, the *King of Glory*, and the *Lord of Glory*?" &c.

The learned President proceeds to a comparison of texts in which these titles and attributes occur: but I am content to give this brief sketch of the questions he thinks it necessary to ask. They are, indeed, most wisely submitted to the consideration of every reader of the Bible. They stand clear of all that has been attributed to either ancient or modern *corruptors* of Christianity; for it is the revealed word of God, in its native and original languages, (if I may so speak) which we are called upon to examine and consider; and that from the very beginning to the end of the Bible. No contrariety of existing MSS. *Hebrew* or *Greek*, no accumulation of *various readings* however great, can do away ALL these evidences. The questions proposed are truly important, for they amount, (I had almost said) to a charge against Providence; a charge which the history of the world seems to support; for if it be really *idolatry* to worship HIM

Version. "The antient Jews and Christian Fathers," says Mr. Bennett, "unite in this, that the person called the Holy One of Israel, was the eternal *Logos*, termed the *Mimra* by the Jews; the *Word* that some ages after, was made flesh, and tabernacled on earth. The uncreated Angel in whom the divine name resided."

who

who is in Scripture dignified with those *high and exalted titles*, upon which the *President* insists, then undoubtedly the temptation to it has been so generally ensnaring, that few have escaped falling into it during the course of more than eighteen hundred years. No difference of opinion upon other subjects, has prevented the great mass of Christians according in *this point*; that *Christ* was a *pre-existent super-angelic Being*, even GOD, and a fit object of *worship*. In this particular, derived to all from the same consideration, namely, the exalted titles, and Godlike attributes assigned to him in Holy Scripture, *Athasians* and *Arians*; *Papists* and *Protestants*; *Calvinists* and *Arminians*, may be said to have been agreed. That he was *no more than man* is the doctrine but of few, and as far as my reading goes, (notwithstanding all that *Dr. Priestley* has advanced to the contrary,) seems always to have been so; since, however, extraordinary efforts are now making to spread this doctrine among us, to the great disparagement, as it appears to me, of the glorious attributes, and exalted dignity of the Redeemer of the World, I have faithfully endeavoured to expose what I conceive to be, *errors of the greatest magnitude*, totally opposite to Scripture, and to the declared opinion of the most eminent critics and commentators, ancient and modern, Jews and Christians.

“May GOD of his mercy grant, that we may all grow in *grace* and in the knowledge of our LORD and SAVIOUR *Jesus Christ*, to HIM be GLORY, both now and for ever, AMEN !”



THE COURT OF

...

...

...



...

...

...

...

...

BY THE SAME AUTHOR;

*Sold by Messrs. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard,  
London, &c.*

‘ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, ‘ΕΙΣ ΜΕΣΙΤΗΣ : or an Attempt to shew how far the Philosophical Notion of a Plurality of Worlds is consistent or not with the Language of the Holy Scriptures. Price 8s. in boards.

Sermons composed for Country Congregations ; dedicated by Permission to her Majesty. Price 7s. in boards.

A View of the Evidences of Christianity at the Close of the pretended Age of Reason : in eight Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford, at St. Mary's, in the Year 1805, at the Lecture founded by the Rev. John Bampton, M. A. Canon of Salisbury. Price 10s. 6d. in boards.

A Sermon preached at the Primary Visitation of the most Rev. the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, at Ashford in Kent, July 13, 1806. Price 1s. 6. Printed at the Request of the Clergy.

Instructions for those that are to be Confirmed, addressed to the Parishioners of Biddenden, Kent, 1806. Price 1s.

A Letter to the Rev. Francis Stone, in reply to his Visitation Sermon preached at Danbury in Essex, July 8, 1806. Price 1s. 6d.

A Sermon on the Duty and Expediency of translating the Scriptures into the current Languages of the East. Preached by special Appointment before the University of Oxford, November 29, 1807. Price 3s. 6d.

A Sermon preached at Biddenden, Kent, on the 25th of October 1809, being the day on which his Majesty entered into the 50th Year of his Reign. Printed by desire.















BS2385 .N16 1810

Nares, Edward, 1762-1841.

Remarks on the version of  
the New Testament lately ed

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
NEW YORK

~~288~~ 225.5 G  
N16



GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



00056528